



2018 Assessment Report

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences	
Art	5
Biological Sciences	18
Communication & Theatre	29
English, Modern Languages, & Journalism	42
Interdisciplinary Studies	64
Mathematics & Economics	74
Music	99
Nursing	111
Physical Sciences	115
Social Sciences	149
Sociology, Anthropology, & Crime and Delinquency Studies	172
General Education Program	190
Honors College	203
Intensive English Program	217
Institutional Effectiveness	222
School of Business	230
School of Library and Information Management	245
The Teachers College	
Counselor Education	255
Elementary Education, Early Childhood & Special Education	267
Health, Physical Education & Recreation	290
Instructional Design & Technology	306
Psychology	315
School Leadership, Middle and Secondary Teacher Education	333
University Libraries & Archives	345

Introduction

Since 2015 Emporia State University has been utilizing the Campus Labs Planning module to coordinate, organize, and evidence the institutional effectiveness of the institution. The Student Learning Improvement Plan is the name of the university's assessment plan. The Student Learning Assessment Council (SLAC) under the leadership of the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness collaborates across the institution to organize faculty and staff in their assessment endeavors. Assessment efforts are organized and operationalized at the department and unit levels. Specialized units including the General Education Program, The Honors College, University Libraries and Archives, and the Intensive English Program also coordinate assessment efforts as a part of the Student Learning Improvement Plan.

The cycle of assessment reporting using the campus labs planning module began in 2015, when the organization, collection, and reporting of assessment efforts was transitioned to a single site electronic repository. All operational units have annual assessment plans in providing continuous cycles of assessment and reporting. These reports are organized by department and specialized unit and include all major degree programs and specialized learning programs identified in the strategic plan such as The Honors College and University Libraries & Archives. There are four years of progressive assessment activities presented in the report and labeled by academic year accordingly. The most current year is reported first.

The student learning improvement plan is designed to allow for the qualitative reporting of the assessment plans, operational findings, strategies, and feedback on assessment efforts. The quantitative evidence and analysis of the individual program, course, and project assessments are linked in the report as attachments. These files are uploaded and organized in the file libraries that exist within the plans and can be seen by clicking on the links. The data files contained in these reports are extensive and show the many types of evidence related to the organization and structure of assessment practices. These files show how the measurement of student learning occurs, the rubrics used to measure and score student performance, and the reports submitted to specialized accrediting bodies. The organization of the assessment practices within the specific major degree programs include the curriculum maps that drive the assessment practices.

The Student Learning Improvement Plan is unique, this plan is designed to push the limits of assessment beyond traditional practices, to think outside the box when experimenting to keep the curriculum current and to consistently improve the student learning experience. Unit leaders such as department chairs and directors are encouraged to try new ways of assessing student learning, to extend their efforts beyond what has traditionally been done, and to engage in dialogue with faculty and staff in identifying next steps and strategies.

In the four years of using this assessment planning tool, institution-wide all programs have updated their curriculum maps by developing program level student learning objectives, defined updated student learning outcomes and communicated the intentions for student learning in all syllabi. Faculty and staff have engaged in planning and implementing assessment practices that are meaningful and sustainable, meanwhile moving forward with incorporating 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans to

ensure the currency of the curriculum and to continuously measure and improve the student learning experience in all courses.

The 2015-2018 Annual Assessment Report is representative of the planning, organizing, implementing, and reporting of university-wide assessment practices in confirming the efficacy of student learning at Emporia State University.

UNIT REPORT**Assessment Report Art 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 9:51 AM

**Art Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

Part of the 2018/19 AY strategic plan is to promote and teach students to embrace a lifelong commitment to the creative process. Knowing that all students do not learn, or process information in the same way or at the same speed, the Art faculty offers multiple approaches to solving a given assignment or problem. This multi-facet approach creates additional learning options that help to accommodate the student who might not learn in the traditional manner. In keeping with utilizing multiple learning modalities, the department is working to develop additional online courses offered through the Art Department to expand our course offering capabilities and reach out to regular and non-traditional students that might have a time conflict or not live in the area. This implementation will provide additional flexibility for both students and faculty, allowing for remote teaching and learning.

In order to adapt to current trends in the professional world, curriculum changes have been submitted and approved to add digital technology based coursework as a requirement for all Art majors. In AY 2018, the department will discuss how this coursework will integrate into and complement current curricula. In addition, we will discuss the possibility of including the teaching of digital image capture and manipulation related to the documentation of student work, so students can more effectively prepare for and participate in portfolio reviews. We will also be discussing and possibly significantly be changing the method by which we evaluate mid-program level work, as well as adding a senior level portfolio review evaluated by all Art faculty.

After reviewing the assessment materials submitted by faculty, both full-time tenure-track and part-time, and looking at the faculty evaluations by students, we will schedule in the fall one-on-one meetings with the Chair to discuss, successes, trends, and any chronic issues that might be reoccurring.

AY 2017

Over the course of this current academic year, Art faculty are working to further develop and utilize assessment mechanisms for General Education courses in Art. Changes are currently being made to General Education courses in Art to align more course outcomes with General Education goals. In addition, faculty are in the process of discussing significant changes to program curricula in all Art degree programs to improve student success in the area of art-related digital technology. These changes, if approved, would further align curricula with Art program outcomes and with the department strategic plan.

AY 2016

Over the course of the year, the faculty in the Department of Art worked to develop the foundation infrastructure by aligning course and program level learning outcomes. The process of updating curriculum maps for each program and developing the alignment between program level and course level student learning outcomes for every course was an extensive and productive process. This exercise was beneficial in ensuring that the curriculum was up to date and for identifying where assessment efforts would be targeted for the 2017 academic year.

AY2015

This is the first year that a department level assessment plan was implemented and we have spent the academic year working towards an inclusive plan for the 2016 academic year.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018 May**

During the fall and spring of 2017-18, the faculty was able to restructure the curriculum for the BFA to better fit the need to implement a

capstone experience / final assessment opportunity for all art majors. We adopted AR 599 Senior Exhibition, as a 1-3 credit to be taken in conjunction with AR 595 Advanced Studio, as the capstone experience for all BFA students. The faculty will develop a general grading rubric for the AR 599, similar to the one used for the Mid-Program-Portfolio-Review to assess the mastery of skills particular to the field of art. The curriculum committee was able to appeal to the General Education Council and embed in the Gen Ed requirements art courses that will now count towards art degree total credits. This was very helpful to implement the goal of reducing the number of credits needed to graduate for our BFA students. This move also elevates the profile of the Art Department by offering Basic Drawing, and Digital Design courses as General Education requirements opening up the department to all students interested in taking a studio or art history course.

We completed our self-study for membership renewal with the National Association of Schools of Art and Design and hosted two NASAD site-visitors May 2018. The site visit was completed by two NASAD volunteers and the visitors reported in their exit interview with the Provost and Dean some of the results of their findings. We will receive a written visitors evaluation after it has been reviewed and confirmed by the NASAD review team. They will issue a report and we will have the opportunity to respond with corrections or solutions to their comments. One issue we know has been a problem and will need to be addressed is the quality and level of the Art History instruction. It has been recorded in the Mid Program Portfolio Review evaluations and BSE student Praxis tests have shown the lack of knowledge in the area of Art History.

The faculty will work on revamping the BSE and BS curriculum to meet the requirement of 120 credits for graduation from the program. We will work with the Teachers College and improve, strengthen, and build up the BSE program and grow the program.

We will continue to expand and build on the high-impact learning experience for our students by creating a Studio Art Internship, professional practices course, that will provide upper-level students with opportunities to work on projects that interface with local businesses and non-profit organizations. *Studio-E*, (formerly The Center for Art and Design) a collaborative partnership between Art, English, and Marketing departments is a professional venture with student interns from each discipline that works together to produce a design product for actual local, regional and later national clients. Students from each discipline, with guidance from a supervisor and area faculty member, will design, consult, produce, and deliver requested design packages and products.

AY 2017

This year learning outcomes for General Education courses in art were aligned with General Education goals and assessment strategies were developed to evaluate those learning outcomes. In addition, two Art courses were proposed and approved to fulfill General Education requirements. Assessment strategies for those courses (AR 101 Basic Drawing, and AR 305 Intro to Digital Design) were developed as well.

In 2017, the Department of Art Faculty had a number of full-participation discussions regarding the lack of a digital technology component in Art programs. Based on faculty research and observations of mid-advanced level art students' performance completing related tasks, it was determined that students lack sufficient ability to process digital images and utilize digital media to communicate information; skills which are necessary for graduates to be successful in any art related field. A curriculum committee was formed and a curricular change proposed (and approved) to make AR 305 Intro to Digital Design a program requirement for all Art degree programs.

This year Art Faculty revisited the most current NASAD site visitors' membership renewal report with the goal of identifying areas that we have improved in response to the report and areas yet to be addressed. The department will be coordinating the next membership renewal site visit in April 2018 and has begun preparing a related self-study report due in early spring 2018.

AY 2016

The use of curriculum maps to prioritize assessment focus will be integrated into the 2017 academic year. Areas of focus will be in the general education course Art Appreciation. The addition of new faculty members is encouraging as conversations for improving alignment with general education course curricula and adopting a different text for the Art Appreciation course (AR 105). The proposed text offers a more comprehensive world view and is much more inclusive, which aligns with the University's strategic plan. The faculty who teach the AR 105 course will review the course student learning outcomes and curriculum to determine if the course provides students the learning experience that faculty determine to be appropriate for the course. It is anticipated that a half-day workshop will bring together the AR105 faculty to complete the alignment with student learning outcomes and identify assessments to be used for the course. This structure can then be used by AR 105 faculty as a working framework for assessing the course. Similar strategies will be pursued at the program level with details provided in the program specific areas.

Center for Art and Design

Over the past several years, the Art Faculty and Chair of the Department of Art have noted a need for more internship opportunities for BFA - Graphic Design students. We also see great potential in a higher-level promotional campaign for the Department of Art. The Department is currently developing a proposal for a "Center of Art and Design." This center will be an in-house, student-staffed art/design firm. The firm

would output creative products for the department (promotional recruitment materials), work for the University, offer services to the larger Emporia community including local business, and students would receive internship credit and high-impact real-world experience.

3-D Printing Technology

Department of Art faculty have, for some years, discussed the desire to add a digital component to 3-D media studies at Emporia State. This desire is based on the common knowledge that some of our competitors have integrated digital technology into their art programs to a greater degree than has been done in Art at ESU. The hope is that by doing so ourselves, we give students skills that may make them more marketable upon graduation, as well as make our programs more competitive.

In 2015, the department submitted a grant and was awarded a 3-D printer. During the fall 2016 semester, 3-D printing and related software will be integrated into one section of AR 103 3-D Design, with the goal of future integration into all sections of 3-D Design, as well as into the curricula of the BFA Glass and BFA Sculpture programs.

Facilities Upgrades

The biggest limiting factor in our ability to recruit quality students to Art programs is arguably, the size and quality of our facilities. The limitations of our facilities, to a degree, affect the level of ambition at which our students can work. For example, small studios necessitate producing artwork on small scales.

Additionally, after the University's most recent NASAD accreditation evaluation, the evaluation team reported that the level of conceptual development apparent in upper level student work was lower than expected. The site visit team reported the lack of individual studio space for upper level students as a likely cause.

In 2015 and 2016, the Department of Art submitted a number of remodel proposals to improve and increase studio space in the department. While the total space of art facilities has been only marginally increased (by 200 sq. ft.), our Sculpture studio was remodeled this 2016 summer, and the Painting studio remodel has been in process since the spring of 2016. The Department has requested (in addition to a new or remodeled Art building) that further remodels to academic spaces in Art be implemented, and that additional space on campus be repurposed as Art studio space with the goal of creating space for upper level students to work.

It would be expected that improvements in studio spaces as well as a significantly increased size of Art facilities would result in continued increases in enrollment (current Art enrollment in fall 2016 is 3 students higher than 2015), and would result in upper level student work that is notably (by NASAD) at a higher level conceptually.

AY 2015

Completion of the curriculum maps at the program level including updating of student learning outcomes at both the program and course level are on the agenda. This process is a work in progress and is a priority for the department. It is important that as we complete this work all of the external specialized accreditation requirements are recognized and met as well.

Attached Files

- [ART_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Art - AY2017](#)
- [NASAD Visitors Report - Emporia State](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ART 2017](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ART 2014](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ART 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ART 2016](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Art - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ART 2018.pdf](#)

Program Name : ART BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

A new Art Education program coordinator began during the 2016-2017 academic year. The previous art education coordinator struggled with illness, resulting in a number of days absent. This individual eventually left her position; however this resulted in the position remaining unfilled during the 2015-2016 academic year. As a result of this transition, there was a lapse in some data collection and follow through with some program assessments. While much of the data was obtainable by the current program coordinator, there were some items, such as the mid-program portfolios that were a bit

more difficult to find scores for all years in the three year cycle.

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the new program coordinator reviewed program assessments in alignment with the new art education standards. As a result of this review some new assessments were put into place to ensure the new standards were met, including the Lesson Plan Assessment and the Art Teaching Portfolio.

When looking at the Praxis II Historical & Theoretical Foundations of Art category (Assessment 1 Data Table) results and the Mid-Program Portfolio-Part 5 (Assessment 6 Data Table) it becomes evident that continued effort must be made to ensure that students have the knowledge they need to build a strong theoretical foundation in art education. Faculty in the methods courses and art history courses and are working to review the curriculum.

As a result of the aforementioned changes to the program, the art education program will be attending even more carefully to the assessment data to ensure that the changes are occurring in the context of candidate improvement relative to meeting the KSDE Visual Arts Standards.

AY 2017

The department is currently preparing the KSDE assessment report due in Fall 2017. Faculty have begun discussing potential curriculum changes for the BSE in response to redefined state/national standards for BSE-ART programs. Additionally, Art faculty and the department chair have begun steps to implement a new method to track BSE-students progress throughout their program with feedback mechanisms.

AY 2016

The BSE program employs the KSDE assessment and reporting cycle to ensure that student learning goals and standards are met. The data collection period is typically on a three year cycle with KSDE reports being due on October 1, 2017. The assessment data is collected on an annual basis with three year benchmark metrics to determine the efficacy of the educational process. KSDE reports and affiliated data files are updated as they become available.

AY 2015

Section V of the KSDE report serves to validate the use of Assessment results to improve candidate and program performance. The report summaries conclude the following prescribed changes: There is a disconnect for Standard 1. The evidence from the content knowledge portion of the Student Teacher Evaluation (Assessment 3), the final course grade from AR235 Art History II Renaissance to Modern (Assessment 5), and the performance on the Scholarly Presentation portion of Assessment 6 clearly and uniformly indicate that the candidates possess the strong scholarly foundation and can clearly connect art to the broad experiences of life. However, the performance on Subscore 1 Traditions in Art, Architecture, Design, and the Making of Artifacts of the Praxis Art Content Exam reflects poor content knowledge. Longitudinally, the 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 program completers were borderline acceptable and, as a program, the faculty did not see this level of performance as a concern because a) the other two subscores of the Praxis were acceptable and b) the the other assessments for Standard 1 were strong. However, the performance for the 2009-2010 program completers is at such a poor level (44% of the questions answered correctly against a benchmark of 70% as the Acceptable level), that the program is reviewing the content and instruction for courses in the art education curriculum to ensure uniform rigor for candidates. The program is also mentoring adjunct faculty teaching courses in the art education curriculum that candidates' having a strong scholarly foundation is crucially important. Aside from Standard 1, the evidence of candidates meeting standards is consistent and positive that standards are being met. The program recognizes and celebrates that candidate evidence indicates that Standards 2, 3, 4 and 5 are strongly met and wants to ensure going forward that Standards 1, 6, and 7 are met at that same high level of quality. Toward this end, program faculty are examining all assessments to a) strengthen their validity and precision in light of the standards, b) determine how assessments can better align with all elements of all standards, and c) ensure multiple assessments to provide plentiful evidence for all standards. The Assessment System in place for art education includes seven assessments. From these seven assessments the evidence is rich from measuring Standard 1 (four assessments), Standard 2 (four assessments), Standard 3 (three assessments), Standard 4 (three assessments), Standard 5 (three assessments), and Standard 6 (two assessments). In contrast, Standard 7 has only one assessment. The program acknowledges that while the Standard 7 assessment (Assessment 5 the final course grade for AR334 Secondary Art Education) is robust, an additional program assessment would enable the faculty clearer discernment that candidates are meeting Standard 7. Because the program can have up to eight assessments, one more assessment can be added.

Attached Files

[Art KSDE 2013-2014](#)

[Assessment 1 Data Tables-Art](#)

[Assessment 2 Data Tables--Art](#)

[Assessment 3 Data Table-Art](#)

[Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)

[Assessment 4 Data Tables--Art](#)

- [KSDE ART REPORT](#)
- [LAS-AR-ART TEACHING FIELD K-12-BSE](#)
- [ESU KSDE ART REPORT.docx](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables-Art.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Tables--Art.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Tables--Art.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table-Art.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Tables--Art.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Tables--Art.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2-OLD-TWS 1-4 - 2014-2016.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - OLD - TWS 5-7 - 2014-2016.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rating Scale MPPR.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Art Lesson Plan Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Scoring Guide - Teaching Portfolio.doc](#)

Program Name: ART BA/BS/BFA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

During the spring the faculty was able to reduce and redesign the curriculum for the BFA to better fit the needs of the students as well as meet the credit reduction requirement or justification mandated by the administration. The curriculum committee was able to appeal to the Gen Ed council and embed in the Gen Ed requirements courses that would count for Art Majors. This was very helpful with the goal of reducing the number of credits needed to graduate for our BFA programs. This move also elevates the profile of the Art Department by allowing Basic Drawing, and Digital Design courses to count as general education requirements for all students that may result in students changing their major to Art.

Keeping the Mid-Program Portfolio Review:

Collaboration:

Revamping Art Education curriculum:

Hiring an Assistant Professor of Graphic Design:

AY 2017

The 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan for the Art BA/BS/BFA has been identified, 2nd year courses have been determined, and details are outlined in the template. This year, based on departmental discussions, conversations with students, feedback from experts working in the discipline of advertising and graphic design, and a number meetings with administrators and faculty in other disciplines on campus (Marketing and English), it was determined that adding a high-impact internship experience in the area of advertising would benefit students in graphic design, Marketing and English concentrations. The respective faculty members and administrators are currently working on a plan to create a student-led on-campus advertising agency. This project could provide students with leadership skills, cross-disciplinary collaboration skills and professional communication skills associated with client interaction. The planning of this project has been informed by critical feedback from previous internship supervisors in the Emporia community that have worked with our students in the past.

In 2017, the Graphic Design concentration curriculum was significantly updated and modernized to reflect the changing contemporary graphic design landscape. All changes were approved, including the addition of a web design course.

AY 2016

Mid-Program Portfolio Review:

In 2015 the Department of Art proposed a new course, AR 400 Art History (Special Topics Title) with the goal of offering the course, AR 400 Art History (Contemporary Art Since 1980). This new course was designed to provide repetition of important knowledge gained in studio courses, but delivered within an art historical context.

This course was offered for the first time in spring 2016 with assessment results being reported in the 2017 academic year.

Annual Juried Student Exhibition:

In 2016, 19% of the work chosen for the Annual Juried Student Exhibition was from Foundation

Studies courses.

In 2012, significant changes were made to the Foundation Studies program curricula. Foundation Studies includes the following courses: AR 101 Basic Drawing, AR 102 2-D Design, and AR 103 3-D Design. From a preceding period (2006-2011) the average number of Foundation Studies works accepted into the Annual Juried Student Exhibition was 3%. From the period following (2012 to present) the average number of Foundation Studies works accepted (including 2016) is 23%, or close to 7 times the acceptance rate compared to the preceding period. The relatively high number of works accepted in 2016 further strengthens the argument that those changes in curriculum have had a significant and positive effect on the results of the Foundations Studies courses listed above.

AY 2015

Mid-Program Portfolio Review: Art History's role in art making

The Department of Art believes that our students should gain knowledge of art history as well as understand the important role that knowledge plays in the modern-day artist's working process. That knowledge and understanding should be evident in our students' work and artspeak. This is assessed during the Mid-Program Portfolio Review. During the review, students at the sophomore or junior level present a selection of their work done thus far at ESU in a professional gallery setting. In addition, each student writes an artist statement and prepares for a question and answer session with the entire faculty. After carefully looking at students' work, every faculty member meets with each student individually and asks them probing questions about their projects and the knowledge and skills they have gained thus far. This happens during the opening reception for the Mid-Program Portfolio Review Exhibition, a major event in the department that is open to the university and the public. The faculty members also have an assessment checklist where grades are given for several learning outcomes — all faculty participate. One of the learning outcomes is as follows:

Art Historical Influence: Evidence of art historical comprehension and influence on work.

While students have historically done above average in this area and are improving, they are generally more successful at achieving the other outcomes that have been assessed during Mid-Program Portfolio Review.

All Art majors are required to take a number of Art History lecture courses as part of their program and students seeking a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree must also take an art history elective course. In addition, faculty members teaching studio courses are expected to introduce students to the work of influential artists, especially work that directly relates to the projects given. However, there has been little coordination between the art history and studio areas. For example, while all studio faculty expose students to both contemporary and traditional artists when guiding students through assignments, there are currently no art history offerings that cover contemporary artist and art movements.

During informal conversations with the Department of Art Chair and other faculty including the current art history professor, it was decided that the repetition of information given across courses could help students better understand the relevance of art historical trends and incorporate that knowledge into their own art making approach. A new course was developed. The content of this course would be contemporary art; 1980 to the present. The specific artists and art movements covered in the course would be determined by polling the studio faculty. Each faculty member will create a list of contemporary artists and movements that they typically expose students to in their studio courses or that have influenced the design of their assignments. The lists will be combined into one collective list; if an artist or movement is included by more than one faculty, the overlap will be noted. The professor of art history will then use this list as a starting point to build the new course. In this way, students will be repeatedly exposed to the same information in different contexts, from an art making perspective and from an art historical perspective. A proposal was presented at a faculty meeting during the 2015 spring semester, and was approved by the faculty.

The department has formally proposed a new course, *AR 400 Art History (Special Topics Title)* with the plan of offering the course, *AR 400 Art History (Contemporary Art Since 1980)*, and is currently waiting approval of this course. Hopefully, after a number of students take this course we will see our students produce work that is more informed by contemporary art history. In addition we hope to observe that our students are more aware of and better able to communicate the connection between the decisions they made in their work and the art historical knowledge they are gaining.

Annual Juried Student Exhibition: The quality of Foundation Studies work

In 2011, after several years of informally assessing the outcome of Foundation Studies courses, the Foundations Coordinator began to make significant changes to a limited number of foundations projects. The goal was to improve the quality of work created in first-year level foundations studies courses; specifically to achieve results that were less like design exercises and more like professional-quality works of art and with a strong connection to contemporary art. New projects were given in a non-conventional, step-by-step manner, taking students through a process that simulated the working process of influential contemporary artists. Emphasis was placed on creating resolved works of

art, not just in learning techniques and principles. The Annual Juried Student Exhibition was used in part, to measure the results.

The Annual Juried Student Exhibition is open to Art majors at all levels, and is juried by an outside juror invited by the Department of Art. Students can submit work done at ESU in the year leading up to the exhibition. This competitive show is valuable professional practice experience for our students, and trends in the works selected can be an indication of the success of our teaching. The external jurors are selected based on their level of professional achievement. For example, this coming spring 2016 exhibition will be juried by Antonia Bostrom, the curatorial director of the Nelson-Atkins Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, former curator of sculpture at the Getty Museum.

The average percent of foundations (freshman) works accepted into the Annual Juried Student Exhibition from 2006-2011 was 3%. In 2012, after changes were made to limited number of assignments, 8% of the works accepted into the Annual Juried Student Exhibition were completed in Foundations courses.

With encouraging results, the Foundations Coordinator changed the majority of foundations assignments given in Foundations courses in the manner described above. The following year (2013), 31% of the work selected for the Annual Juried Student Exhibition was from foundations courses. The majority of that work was from courses taught by the Foundations Coordinator utilizing the new projects.

During that year (2013), emphasis was then placed on introducing those projects to other faculty teaching additional sections of Foundations courses. In 2014, 25% of works selected for the Annual Juried Student Exhibition were from Foundations courses with more than half of that work coming from sections taught by other faculty.

In 2015, 17% of the work chosen for the Annual Juried Student Exhibition was from Foundation Studies courses with half of the work generated in sections taught by other faculty. This trend can be seen in the uploaded accompanying graph, *Foundations Work and Student Exhibition Graph*.

Attached Files

- [Foundations Work and Student Exhibition Graph](#)
- [LAS-AR-PAINTING-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-SCULPTURE-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-PRINTMAKING-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-PHOTOGRAPHY-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-GRAPHIC-DESIGN-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-GLASS-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-ENGRAVING-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-CERAMICS-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ART-BSA](#)
- [LAS-AR-BACHELOR OF ART IN ART-BFA](#)
- [LAS-AR-ART-THERAPY-BFA](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The faculty in the Department of Art continue to innovate and adapt their curriculum in meaningful and effective ways. By recognizing that students have different learning styles and incorporating different types of assignments and delivery modes, the curriculum evolves in a productive fashion. This keeps the curriculum fresh and creates engaging learning experiences for their students. Expanding access opportunities through online delivery is beneficial for all student sectors and increasing the use of technology in the Art disciplines is beneficial to preparing professionals. The use of technology tools to capture and manipulate student works and artifacts creates a more inclusive learning environment and ties together the different delivery modalities. The addition of the Basic Drawing and Digital Design courses to the General Education program offerings allows for students to develop fundamental application skills that can complement a variety of major programs of study, including Art.

The restructure of the BFA curriculum by adding the AR599 Senior Exhibition capstone experience was a nicely calculated change. I envision the benefit of this course in capturing the quality of student learning at the end of the program and comparing the improvements and changes since the Mid-Program Portfolio review. It may be beneficial to align the rubric used for the Mid-Program Portfolio review with the rubric used for the AR599 Senior Exhibition Portfolio review. The descriptions of student competency and mastery levels can be different for the two distinct points in time when the reviews are to occur. However, if you align the rubrics it will create symmetry between the reviews and faculty will be better at evaluating student learning using a familiar rubric tool. The program level learning objectives as shown in the curriculum map wouldn't change over time, but their levels of students' competency and mastery would be expected.

The high impact learning environment created by Studio E is awesome. Providing students opportunities to collaborate with others, gain valued experience working in a professional environment, and producing products and projects that mirror what they will be doing as professionals is definitely high impact. In addition, teaching students how to bring together multiple types of expertise (Art, English, and Marketing) in building a project/product is the ultimate of engagement in teamwork and synergy. Students will enhance their employment opportunities by participating in internships in Studio E, it is a win-win scenario.

The Art BSE program is embracing the challenges brought about by a situation that was unfortunate. Having a colleague who is unable to work due to medical conditions is always stressful, and advancing the program during these times is difficult. It is apparent that your new faculty program director has worked diligently to pull together those artifacts that were available and has made some nice additions to future assessment collections by incorporating new "Lesson Plan Assessment" and "Art Teaching Portfolio" student work samples. It may prove beneficial to dedicate some time to articulating the methods and means of archiving students assessment data electronically. The "plan of how it is being done" and the method of "who collects, records, and archives" the information will serve the department well in times of transition.

It is encouraging that the faculty are spending time and efforts on identifying change strategies to improve student learning related to Art History and Theoretical Foundations in Art Education. Identifying curricular changes and going through the process is always a time intensive commitment, but based on the fact that this deficiency is presenting for both Praxis II and Mid-Program Portfolio reviews, it appears to be of high importance.

In the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan your reporting and summary in the 1-4 Year area is a good reflection of the approach you are taking once the AR599 course is operational this fall 2019 term is good. Be sure to upload your blank rubric once it is developed, then in subsequent years you can add in your results as an evidence document as well. In the Year 2 section, the student success metrics showed that for all courses 85% to 90% of the students were progressing through the courses successfully. On the individual course assessments, the faculty did a nice job of describing the assignments and projects being assessed. Articulating the intended learning experiences can be challenging, but the faculty did a nice job. It may be beneficial for faculty to write some more reflection directed toward analyzing some of the challenges and barriers that students faced as a part of the assignment or project. This analysis assists us as professional educators to work through the progressions of what worked well and what didn't. This leads to the next step of thinking through and identifying change strategies that can help students navigate the learning experience with higher levels of proficiency. I'm always available to assist faculty in their assessment endeavors, please contact me if your faculty are interested. Nice job on the assessment report, it is encouraging to see all the great advancements the faculty are making in the curriculum and student learning experiences. I appreciate all your efforts!

Academic Year 2017

Another productive year of utilizing faculty expertise in research and assessment findings to advance the Art department. The intuition to expand the mid-year portfolio reviews to include the capstone assessment of portfolio reviews is a very strategic change to current assessment practices. Although it may take some time to implement the practice in its entirety, it is sure to provide some key information about how students progress through their major programs of study. It will shape your curriculum going forward more than you think. The transitions in the curriculum for the use of digital media to process and communicate information was perfect and the timeliness for the changes was important. The requirement for the AR305 Intro to Digital Design was a key change, as is the collaboration with the Marketing and the English faculty to create a high impact learning experience that has all the qualities of a real-world job. The creation of the on-campus advertising agency connects succinctly to the strategic plan goal 1. The work of the faculty in regard to general education course embedded assessment is greatly appreciated. The work with integrating student learning outcomes and general education program goals into the syllabi for general education Art courses is a best practice. Creating these connections is important to the student as a learner as well, as making the connections apparent is key to creating value for the learning. The two courses approved for the general education program curriculum this past year are great, the approach to student learning and practical application of knowledge and skills provides an enhanced learning experience for the student. An experience that is likely to be used in the application of career related skills regardless of the students' major programs of study. Kudos for the vision to do this, it would benefit our overall general education program to have a few more courses with this complementary (cognitive/psychomotor) type of learning experience approach. You have positioned the department well for the upcoming NASAD membership renewal in Spring of 2018. Current assessment planning and practices along with the integrative assessment and reporting for the Kansas Department of Education should prove beneficial. Continue to encourage faculty to participate in the course-embedded assessment process, as the assessment of individual courses using the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plans for the degree programs will also provide key insights for individual course learning contributions across the major curricula. Once you complete this 5-Year cycle the first time, it will be easier the second time around as you will have a better sense of how to divide up the many courses that make up the curriculum. Good work and kudos to the Art faculty for their commitments to improving the student learning experience and the continuous evolution of the department!

Academic Year 2016

The ART department faculty continue to dedicate efforts in multiple ways to improve the student learning experience, taking into consideration the importance of continuous improvement in the curriculum, facilities, and community support. The community support piece in developing a proposal for a Center of Art and Design aligns well with the strategic plan Goal 1 - Pursue distinctive initiatives in curricula and programs that will foster vibrant communities. The student experiences in these high impact practices creates that unique learning environment you are striving for. Inclusion of the general education assessment for AR 105, and the plan for faculty to collectively direct assessment efforts to confirm student learning and continuous improvement by developing alignment across student learning outcomes and the general education goals is outstanding. The insights by faculty to change the text to one of more diverse perspectives is fitting for the work being done by the institution as a whole to become more inclusive and diverse in our operations. The numbers and percentage of students being selected for juried review speaks volumes for the work being done by faculty to ensure the quality of students educational experiences. Implementing technology such as the 3-D printer into the curriculum is encouraging and all efforts to keep students learning about new methods and how technology influences the arts is a good thing. In 2017, try using the curriculum maps for your programs and have faculty select a couple of courses to specifically integrate course embedded assessments. Approach the assessments as a way to identify where faculty want to improve students knowledge and skills. Let the faculty decide the direction for these course selections and assessments. Use rubrics to score the student works, and share findings through the faculty ranks. Use this information to strategize and employ changes useful to enhancing the student learning experience. The departments approach to the inclusive learning experience is good, keep building on faculty dialogue and work together to solve some of the barriers that may exist or limit student learning. Go forward together!

Academic Year 2015

The ART assessment plan is well structured and includes course level embedded assessments, internal and external reviews of student art works, and program reviews. The main emphasis for the 2014-2015 academic year was to collaborate with program faculty and determine the currency of the respective curriculum. In addition, the updating of both program level and course level student learning outcomes would culminate the process. The ART department follows many expectations of external specialized accreditation including those for art education and the professional arts. Meeting these accreditation expectations dictates a large part of the curriculum and sets standards and performance levels for student knowledge and skills. For the ART BSE program, it is recommended that you determine additional assessments for Standard 7 as prescribed in your report. It may be more productive to add in one assessment at a time (per year) to insure that you are measuring student learning as you envision it to be occurring. Adding in multiple assessments all at once can be problematic and inefficient. Once you confirm that the new assessment is measuring what it is supposed to, then it is appropriate to add in another one. Typically, three assessments should provide a way to triangulate the findings to make decisions about changing the curriculum or pedagogy to improve student learning of the standard. The Mid-Program portfolio review is a good time to assess student development and works. The disconnect between the studio expectations and the art history piece was a great assessment find. I am curious about how the new AR 400 course fits in the curriculum. Is the course going to be a requirement or an elective? If required, what course would it replace in the required curriculum? If it is an elective, how do you see the timing of the course coinciding with other course sequencing. This is a great idea and a fine example of faculty collaboration in creating a solution to the disconnect, so kudos. Be sure to follow up on this one, I think it is going to be a highly effective change. The Annual Juried Art Exhibition is a great way to encourage students to share their works and to provide recognition for those works deemed worthy by an external professional in the field. The improvements made in student participation and the quality of works being submitted from foundations courses is noteworthy and brings credibility to the process you have initiated with faculty sharing assignment structure and successes in foundations courses. Next steps, as you complete the curriculum reviews at the program and course levels take a look at the general education courses that your department offers and work these into the mix of course assessments. Often these courses make large contributions to students foundational knowledge and concurrently contribute to general education program learning goals. By assessing the student learning in the course related to program goals, you can also include the assessment of the general education goal, thus looking at both programs to improve the student learning. This creates an efficiency for the faculty teaching the course while fulfilling the need to measure contributions of the course to the general education program goals. In the upcoming 2016 academic year, continued collaborations among faculty to improve student learning is encouraged. Focus your efforts on identifying those areas of need that faculty want to focus on to improve student learning. If possible, dedicate some time in every faculty meeting on assessment endeavors. Encourage faculty interaction and dialogue. Share your assessment results and successes with students both continuing and prospective. Sharing what you do as a department with juried review is a great way to promote the student Art experience and highlight students educational opportunities.

Providing Department: Art

Responsible Roles:

Downi Griner (E11098169), Eric Conrad (E10000090), Derek Wilkinson (E10344588), Joan Brewer (E10000569), Roberta Eichenberg (E10088448)

5-YEAR ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Art BA/BS/BFA**Start:** 07/01/2016**End:** 06/30/2022**Progress:** Ongoing over Multiple Years**Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:**

The Department of Art is discussing ways in which capstone courses for specific BFA concentrations (and potentially BS and BA program tracks) could be used to capture portfolio review student artifacts that will be scored by multiple faculty using the program level checklist (rubric). The checklist, may, in part, align with the rubric used for Mid-Program Portfolio Review, to provide data from the mid-point and end-point of programs.

Summary 2018

The Department of Art developed a capstone course AR 599 Senior Exhibition to be taken with AR 595 Senior Projects where a professional level project or exhibition would be realized and a basic grading rubric of mastery would be utilized for evaluation of the project. This course was just added to the curriculum and will be put into practice for the first time in fall of 2019. There is currently no data for the capstone course as it has not been implemented as of this writing. The Graphic Design concentration has its own capstone course offered in the spring during their last semester, Graphic Design Senior Exhibit, where all the seniors develop and produce a final individual project and display as a group. This has been very successful in preparing seniors for a professional placement due to the fact that they work on not only the final exhibit materials but assemble a final portfolio at the end of the course.

Summary 2019**Summary 2020****Summary 2021**

Attached Files

[LAS-AR-ENGRAVING-BFA](#)[LAS-AR-ENGRAVING-BFA 1](#)[LAS-AR-BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ART-BS 1](#)[LAS-AR-BACHELOR OF ART IN ART-BFA](#)[LAS-AR-BACHELOR OF ARTS IN ART-BA 1](#)**Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:****Stephanie Lanter: AR 314 Ceramics I:**

Of the students taking this course 88% of students exceeded the expectations 10% met expectations and 5% did not meet expectations for this course.

The assessment methods for this unit, "Clay Body Armor," was a multi-part art project: sculpture, performance, photograph and writing. To examine the relationship between form and function, as it relates to the body - To practice various surface design techniques. As a result of the assessments during the course the instructor adapted her grading to reflect what she felt were weaknesses in her teaching - she was not as stringent on grading assemblage, and felt she could have helped them more and that they needed more time to work on the project.

James Ehlers: AR 300/AR 309 Engraving I

Of the students taking this course 60.% exceeded expectations, 30.% met expectations and 10.% did not meet expectations.

Most art students have little to no background in crosshatching, which is a foundational component to successful engraving. This project was created to help students become more proficient in rendering a

wide range of tone with line and dots. Students are learning how to render tone with line on a cylinder, a circle, a cube and a flat surface. The overall results are good and this has been a project I began implementing a couple of years ago. Students create metal engravings of still life objects utilizing the following rubric - 15 Points - Contour 15 Points - Tonal transition 15 Points – appropriate line proximity, consistency throughout image 15 Points - Line follows form (correct use of hatching) 15 Points - width consistent 15 Points - forms clearly defined from each other 15 Points - Craft. They obtain the skill much faster and were able to apply it with more sophistication in future projects.

Morgan Ford Willingham: AR 315 Photography I

Of the students taking AR 315, 59.1% exceeded expectations, 31.85 met expectations and 9.1% did not meet expectations.

A technical notebook project was used to measure student learning in AR 300 Workshop, Alternative Photographic Processes. The purpose of the project is to allow students time to become comfortable working with unfamiliar materials, before moving onto creating research projects utilizing those materials. The notebook serves as an opportunity for experimentation and to understand the reasoning behind using various materials in their artwork, so that there is less guess and, hopefully, frustration once the class begins their creative research. Based purely on the statistical data, 40% of the class appears to not be meeting expectations. The Technical Notebook assignment also overlapped two projects in which students were further perfecting their technical and creative skills with specific processes. After considering the outcome last spring, I decided to introduce all the techniques at the beginning of the semester to have the notebook due date pushed up earlier in the semester.

Patrick Martin: AR 302 Glass Forming I

Of the students taking this course 100% of the students participate for this assignment requirement and performed close to what I had expected. For the first time, I allowed the students to choose just one of the sand-casting assignments out of two options. The wall relief sculpture must incorporate multiple materials and include at least 3-5 cast pieces. To create a dynamic form, incorporating variety while limited to the repetition of multiple cast glass forms, maintaining rhythm, unity, balance, and proportion. Take into consideration all of the principles of three-dimensional design: repetition, variety, rhythm, balance, economy, emphasis, and proportion. Be aware that too much variety invites chaos.

Mayela Cárdenas: AR 240 Graphic Design Processes

Of the students taking this course 80.% exceeded expectations, 10.% met expectations and 10.% did not meet expectations.

The final project was used to measure student learning for this course. In general, everyone exceeded my expectations on the performance of the task and quality of the work. Two students did not meet expectations. Strategies going forward include give the student more time to work on the project and allow more free time during class to finalize the project.

Roberta Eichenberg: AR 323 Sculpture I

Of the students taking this course 60.% exceeded expectations, 30.% met expectations and 10.% did not meet expectations.

The Concept Drawing Assignment is required for each of the four physical project assignments spanning the entire semester. This assignment is given to augment and support the research of the three-dimensional project assignment a research component of each material sculpture project. I added a writing and research element recently requiring students look up three artists who work three-dimensionally and write a short paragraph about each one of those artists and describe how their work

relates to the project they are developing. After requiring the students to add this written exercise it was clear that they connected what they had researched to what they were trying to construct. 100% of the students participated in this assignment requirement and performed better than I had expected. I was impressed with the correlations they discovered between their ideas and the concepts they researched via the artists they wrote about. This assignment is given to augment and support the research for the four primary project assignments. This is the self-directed research component for each of the four material projects. Adding this search component of selecting three artists that support their concept, approach or method, has proven to be invaluable to their understanding of an alternate approach to a similar idea or concept as theirs and encourages self-discovered pathways to the execution of their idea. In the age of sound bites and fleeting attention spans, this approach fits into the current rhythm of the social media pace of information delivery. As a self-directed exercise, they are free to look at artists that are not on my lists for a particular assignment and this provides a feeling of ownership that supports more of a Socratic teaching and learning approach. Strategies for improving student learning are to continue to require the written component of the project planning process to encourage students to develop better research habits and expand their knowledge base.

Downi Griner: AR 324 Elementary Art Education

Of the students taking this course 85.% exceeded expectations, 15.% met expectations and 0.% did not meet expectations.

I measured student learning through independent projects, lesson plans, art work and a presentation to the class. All of the students in this course claimed to have no prior knowledge of art. They all succeeded in showing growth by gaining new art education knowledge and were successful at creating art projects and lesson plans that were detailed and clear.

Eric Conrad: AR 101 Basic Drawing

Of the students taking this course 75.% exceeded expectations, 15.% met expectations and 10.% did not meet expectations.

Student learning measured by drawing. This semester students were asked to do all preliminary drawing exercises and practice drawings for the first blind contour drawing directly on the final drawing, instead of doing those separately as was done in the past. This resulted in a richer, multi-layered final drawing, and the drawing was completed more quickly and efficiently allowing more time to be spent on subsequent projects. No change strategies are planned at this time.

Derek Wilkinson: AR 310 Painting I

Of the students taking this course 70.% exceeded expectations, 20.% met expectations and 10.% did not meet expectations.

Currently students are required to complete six paintings some of the most skilled students have difficulty completing all six paintings to the highest level they are capable of during a single semester. Students are tasked with creating their own schedule based on the type of paintings they wish to produce, which includes when they are going to start and finish each piece, and what they will be working on each week. Students are assigned a midterm grade, but it functions more like an estimation of how they are doing at that point rather than affecting their final grade. The final grade is based on the work they produced over the entire semester including the final portfolio of paintings and the written documents. They don't face any consequences if they are behind at midterm other than being forced to put in a lot of work right at the end of the semester. Their overall class experience and the work they produce would be much stronger if

they had steady progress throughout the semester. Other painting courses don't have such big issues with procrastination, because work is collected to be graded at least once earlier in the semester. This means they only have to worry about a portion of the class load at the end of the semester.

Marie Dolemba: AR 225 Art History I

No data provided at this time.

2018 Summary

We are working to provide students with a range of educational experiences and modalities through diverse teaching systems and approaches to deliver important information and knowledge. Critical thinking, problem-solving, project management, all have a direct link and are built into the fabric of the Art making process. The initial project research, model designs, maquettes, and preliminary sketches, are reviewed, discussed, and adjusted prior to realizing the final form. This planning, discussing, reworking and resolving design modifications for a given assignment is embedded in many of the programs offered in the Department of Art. Exposing students to diverse and varied skill-based assignments and projects, reinforce the fundamental knowledge they will need to train them to produce a variety of art based projects. This multi-pronged approach to teaching prepares students to be successful in a complex working environment where they are able to conceive multiple solutions to a given problem.

Write to the whole success of the learning experience: Much of the information and knowledge disseminated during classes offered in the Art Department are broken down into the essential elements, by doing this the instructors are able to demystify how to accomplish a specific creative project or process. Simplifying and dissecting a process into basic components in such a way allows students to feel that they can also gain a level of mastery of that skill. Assessing the effectiveness of our teaching on a regular basis will help to identify successes that can be expanded upon and shared, as well as addressing chronic issues that can be headed off and adjusted. For the most part students in the Department of Art are succeeding in their classes, but we have areas that need attention and must be improved to ensure students are gaining the knowledge, skills, and information they require to be successful as a professional.

Attached Files

- [Cardenas-Mayela-AR240-FA17.pdf](#)
- [All Art Department Assessment Reports Combined-AY18.pdf](#)
- [Conrad-Eric-AR101-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Ehlers-James-AR300-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Eichenberg-Roberta-AR323-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Eichenberg-Roberta-AR595-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Lanter-Stephanie-AR314-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Martin-Patrick-AR302-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Martin-Patrick-AR595-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wilkinson-Derek-AR310-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Ping-Wendy-AR324-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wilkinson-Derek-AR491-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Willingham-Morgan-AR300-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Willingham-Morgan-AR305-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses:

2019 Summary

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses

2020 Summary

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Art BA, BS, BFA

Responsible Roles: Downi Griner (E11098169), Eric Conrad (E10000090), Roberta Eichenberg (E10088448)

UNIT REPORT**Assessment Report Biological Sciences 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 10:00 AM

**Biological Sciences Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2019**

The Department of Biology will focus on using the assessment data generated over the past 10 years to critically evaluate our B.S. program and to begin working to adapt our "core" curriculum to address the areas where our students show weaknesses. We will also work on writing course-level learning outcomes that align with our program objectives. It will also be a priority to create an "end of program" assessment as part of the oral comprehensive exam of our M.S. students.

AY 2018

The Major Fields Test continues to be the primary assessment tool for undergraduate Biology majors. In order to generate reasonable data sets it is necessary to administer the exam for two consecutive years before producing a report. Based on this assessment data. The department is discussing a change to the "core curriculum" that is required of all biology majors.

AY 2017

(1) Department of Biological Sciences will continue to administer the Major Fields Test in GB 481 Senior Experience. Institutional "Total Score" and "Subscores" means will be compared to national average of institutions using the test.

We will also obtain Major Fields Test "assessment indicator" scores. These are aggregate scores for the test cohort and align directly with the learning outcomes. Institutional score will be compared to average of all U.S. institutions using the test. According to the assessment indicator scores, we will identify the deficiency of our students in the learning outcomes, and will initiate discussions within four area committees (General Biology, Ecology and Biodiversity, Microbial & Cellular Biology and Zoology) for curriculum review. Each area committee will propose suggestions for curriculum revision to the biology faculty in a faculty meeting. The core requirements of B.S. in Biology will be also reviewed and the curriculum revision will also be proposed. (2) the Biology department will administer Scientific Literacy, which intends to evaluate students' analytical skills, interpreting data and critiquing experiment design skills, and reading and interpreting graphical representation skills.

(3) Department will implement an exit interview for senior students. To achieve that goal, an online exit interview survey will be created.

AY 2016

The curriculum mapping exercises and the inclusion of student learning outcomes in syllabi will be a key part of our assessment work for the upcoming year. The Biology BSE program assessments are transitioning due to changes at the state level with the KSDE reporting requirements, so this assessment work is being done as well. It is anticipated that the curriculum mapping will help in identifying where assessment efforts should be directed. In addition, faculty focus groups have been scoring student works on a common rubric to determine whether or not students are effectively meeting program learning outcomes.

AY 2015

Department of Biological Sciences will administer the Major Fields Test in GB 481 Senior Experience. Institutional "Total Score" and "Subscores" means will be compared to national average of institutions using the test.

We will also obtain Major Fields Test "assessment indicator" scores. These are aggregate scores for the test cohort and align directly with the learning outcomes. Institutional score will be compared to average of all U.S. institutions using the test.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Level Key Strategies and Adaptations and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

We closed the most recent MFT cohort (Fall 2016-Spring 2018) this data set includes test scores for 58 graduates and brings our grand total to 225 dating back to Fall 2007. Faculty have made subtle changes to course-level curriculum over this time frame as faculty have adapted the topics of their courses and/or content delivery to address areas of concern revealed by the test. However, as a department we have been unable or unwilling to use this data to make large scale curriculum changes or to incorporate course-level assessments to provide supportive evidence and this remains a key strategy going forward.

AY 2017

Analyzing the assessment indicator scores of the Major Field Test, we acknowledge the areas where ESU students score equitable to nationally benchmarked peer institutions and identify those areas where deficiencies exist. Department faculty will engage in discussion within four area committees (General Biology, Ecology and Biodiversity, Microbial & Cellular Biology and Zoology) related to student learning improvement strategies and curriculum review. Each area committee will propose suggestions on curriculum revision to the biology faculty in a faculty meeting. The core requirements of B.S. in Biology will be also reviewed and the curriculum revision will also be proposed. These committee meetings will occur in the fall of 2017 as we implement the KSDE (August 2017) report findings and change strategies. The curriculum courses for the Biology BSE program are concurrently a part of the Biology BS/BA courses, thus student learning improvement strategies are applicable to these courses as well. We have transitioned the Biology BS/BA, the Biology MS/MA, and the Forensic MS programs to a 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan format to begin these cycles in AY 2018.

AY 2016

The curriculum mapping exercises provided some key findings to focus future assessment efforts including working on the coordination of graduate faculty in advising, mentoring, and assessing the two separate degree tracks. It was determined that a good many of the students were pursuing the MA degree instead of the MS degree, which created a big differential in the mentoring requirements for faculty. The chair is proposing a combining of the two degrees (MA and MS) into one master of science degree with two degree track options. The findings for the faculty focus groups is described and evidenced in the Biology MS/MA section.

AY 2015

The ETS Major Field Test will produce an "assessment indicator", which is a further breakdown of our institutional scores on the MFT compared to national benchmarks. This data is only reported as an aggregate institutional score. The MFT will be able to help us identify students' deficiencies in sub-areas. In response to this assessment we will conduct a survey of the biology faculty who teach "core" classes to ascertain the degree of coverage of these topics. It is hoped that next year's curriculum mapping exercises will lead to alignment for these sub-areas within the overall curriculum.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES 2014](#)
- [Critical Thinking Assessments Report - General Education Program June 2015](#)
- [BIO General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Biological Sciences - AY2017](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Biological Sciences - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES 2018.pdf](#)

Program Name: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology BS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

The chemistry courses that make up the curriculum of the program are included in the Chemistry accreditation through the American Chemistry Society. This reaffirmation of the ACS accreditation occurred during the past year and the affiliated reports are in the file library. The Biology courses are included in the course assessments for the Biology BA/BS/BSE which we are currently assessing and analyzing based on the Major field test. It is anticipated that some topics may show to be needing more attention in the curriculum. The BMB program is transitioning to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan beginning in the 2018 academic year.

AY 2016

The assessment plan for BMB program is in the process of being updated as the courses supporting this program are actually taught by faculty in two affiliated sciences departments (chemistry and biology disciplines). The courses are already a part of the curricular assessment for the Chemistry BA/BS program and the Biology BA/BS/BSE program. The program is assessed collaboratively with both the department

chair from Physical Sciences and a faculty member from the Biology department. The curriculum map for this shared program was mapped this past 2016 academic year and the updated assessment plan will be forthcoming in the fall of 2016.

Attached Files

- [American Chemical Society Accreditation Letter 8-23-2017](#)
- [ACS 2016 Program Review](#)
- [LAS-PS-BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY-BS](#)

Program Name: Biology BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The Curriculum map and sequencing of course-level assessments was updated to include only those courses required for the major and electives chosen by a majority of students.

Based on data from the Course Grade Success spreadsheet 35% of students do not meet expectations in GB140, 27% do not meet expectations in our second level classes: BO212 (23%), MC316 (16%), GB425 (45%) and ZO214 (34%). This may partly explain the retention problem we have (see retention report).

The MFT remains our primary assessment tool for the program. Reports below show a continued trend for our senior students to be weak in the areas of Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics.

AY 2017

The Biology BS/BA program assessment is transitioning to the 5-year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan to accommodate for the assessment of the complete course curriculum. The Biology BSE degree is assessed using the Kansas Department of Education standards and the assessment of the entire curriculum over the 5-year cycle will provide for a more comprehensive review of the courses.

AY 2016

Student learning outcomes will be assessed by administering the Major Fields Test in GB 481 Senior Experience. Institutional "Total Score" and "Subscores" means will be compared to national average of institutions using the test.

We will also obtain Major Fields Test "assessment indicator" scores. These are aggregate scores for the test cohort and align directly with the learning outcomes. Institutional score will be compared to average of all U.S. institutions using the test. The learning outcomes of Department of Biological Sciences are:

I. Graduates with a B.S. degree in biology from ESU have a broad and solid foundation of biological knowledge. Specifically they can demonstrate this knowledge in the areas of:

- A. Biochemistry and energetics
- B. Cell structure, Organization and Function
- C. Molecular Biology and Molecular Genetics
- D. Organismal Diversity
- E. Zoology
- F. Botany
- G. Population Genetics and Evolution
- H. Ecology

II. Graduates with a B.S. degree in biology from ESU understand and are skilled in the processes of biological research.

- A. (Experimental)
 - i. They can formulate testable hypotheses that distinguish between a number of plausible alternative explanations.
 - ii. They can design experiments that will generate reliable evidence that is relevant to a hypothesis.

B. (Analytical) They are able to read, create and interpret graphs of scientific data

C. (Statistical) They are able to explain the results of inferential statistical tests.

D. (Technical) They are confident in the use of instruments commonly used in biological research.(i.e spreadsheet programs, pipettes, microscopes)

E. (Communication) Students can summarize and explain biological research (their own or of others) in a clear, reasonable and logical manner through written or verbal means.

Attached Files

[LAS-BI-BIOLOGY-BS](#)

[Burnett-Tim-GB480-SP18.pdf](#)

[Edds-David-ZO215-FA17.pdf](#)

[Edds-David-ZO214-FA17.pdf](#)

[Edds-David-ZO214-SP18.pdf](#)

[Edds-David-ZO215-SP18.pdf](#)

[Powell-Alexis-GB140-SP18.pdf](#)

[Sievert-Lynette-GB140-SP18.pdf](#)

[Martin-Erica-GB141-SP18.pdf](#)

[Sundberg-Marshall-BO212-AY18.pdf](#)

[Sundberg-Marshall-BO213-AY18.pdf](#)

[F14_SP18_test_summary.xlsx](#)

[F10-Sp14 TestSummary.xlsx](#)

[F07_Sp10_Test Summary.xlsx](#)

[Retention trends_Biology.xlsx](#)

Program Name: Biology BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The BSE Biology program at ESU is in transition due to the recent retirement of our long-standing director and student advisor. Currently there are no definitive plans for how the Biology Department will continue with the program, or if they will continue to advise students. Our program has had a very small number of completers during the previous three years (n=7). This severely limits the utility of extrapolating these results to the program as a whole. Nonetheless, our assessments indicate a few generalities that might be helpful to whoever takes the reigns of the program going forward. These are:

1. The relatively high number of Biology classes and the inclusion of the BSE students within the department produces teacher candidates that know content extremely well. The course grades, Praxis content test and the Major Fields test collectively demonstrate high proficiency in the standards related to content. Changes to the delivery of content or a reduction in the number of courses required for BSE majors should be carefully considered and applied cautiously.
2. Students in this program require and deserve expert mentoring throughout the program. The assessments related to the practice of teaching indicate one student had a rough time with the student teaching component of the program. This outcome can be avoided by early intervention and guidance of a program advisor that cares deeply about student success, interacts with the students from an early stage and has a strong belief in the quality of the program. An advisor with relevant and recent experience in the practice of teaching biology will be best suited to continue the strong traditions of teacher training at ESU and help to strengthen the program.

AY 2017

The Kansas Department of Education assessment requirements for the Bachelor of Education in Biology degree include assessment of student competencies in the core concepts of Biology as well as measures of students ability to lesson plan, integrate learning strategies to meet different types of learners, and to gain an extensive practical experience with assessment of teaching abilities by the supervising teacher in the field. The standards for the Biology core has recently undergone revision by the KSDE and assessments aligning with these new expectations will be implemented in the upcoming academic year. The KSDE report and data files are in the process of being completed and will be uploaded to the file library early in the fall 2017 term.

AY 2016

A key biology faculty member who has taught in the Bachelor of Science in Biology program for many years recently proposed to terminate the BSE program. The faculty will discuss and vote for whether the BSE will be terminated or not in fall semester of 2016. Currently, the

KSDE report for the program has no completers, thus no data files to upload or findings to update for this area. The curriculum map for the BSE is included in the mapping for the three programs BA/BS/BSE as all three share common courses in their respective curricula.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table 2017](#)
- [Assessment 2 Scoring Guide 2017](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table 2017](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2017](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2017](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data table 2017](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables 2017](#)
- [Biology 2017 KSDE Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Scoring Guide 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data table 2017.docx](#)
- [Biology Program of Study.pdf](#)
- [ESUBiology Template NewStandards may2018.docx](#)

Program Name: Biology MS/MA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

Course level assessments for graduate classes were conducted for seminar (GB770/771) and Animal Behavior (ZO530). Grade distributions for these classes are nearly 100% met or exceed expectations. The department is working on creating rubrics for the comprehensive examinations that are required for all students.

AY2017

The data for the assessment of the master thesis and research projects was collected and analyzed for those students who completed their degree requirements during the 2017 academic year. The faculty analysis of the students abilities to engage in research projects in both the MS and MA programs was consistent with the performances from the 2015 assessments. There were some increased performances in the students ability to present their research projects. Students remained strong in their abilities to identify appropriate research literature and apply specific biology topic knowledge to write publishable literature based on research discoveries.

AY2016

At the end of the spring 2015 semester, each faculty was given a survey to quantitatively assess the three learning outcomes of the Master of Science and Master of Arts programs. Biology faculty ranked student performance/competency/skills in regards to the learning outcomes using scale of 1-5: (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) good, (4) very good and (5) excellent;

The learning outcomes of M.S. program are:

- (1) Students demonstrate in-depth knowledge of facts and concepts in a concentration area of biology.
- (2) Students demonstrate aptitude in research design, data collection, data analysis, and reporting findings of scientific research.

(3) Students are able to critically read primary literature, effectively communicate scientific research through writing and speaking.

In the survey, the learning outcome (3) is divided into three sub-objectives. Biology faculty gave high ratings for the learning outcomes of our M.S. program. All the faculty members rated "good", "very good" or "excellent" to all the five learning objectives except one learning outcome "Students are able to critically read primary literature", for which only one faculty member rated it "poor".

The learning outcomes of M.A. program are:

- (1) Students demonstrate in-depth knowledge of facts and concepts in a concentration area of biology.
- (2) Students are able to explain applications of research methodologies and analyses relevant to the student's concentration area.
- (3) Students are able to critically read primary literature, effectively communicate scientific knowledge through writing and speaking.

In the survey, the learning outcome (3) is divided into three sub-objectives.

Biology faculty expressed more concerns on M.A. program. For the learning outcome (1), 27.3% of faculty rated "poor" or "fair", and only one faculty member rated "very good" and no faculty rated "excellent". For the learning outcome (2), 36.4% of faculty members did not satisfy M.A. students' ability to explain applications of research methodologies and analyses. In addition, 27.3% of faculty members rated "effectively communicate the scientific knowledge through speaking" as "fair". However, most faculty members were pleased with students' ability of critically reading primary literature and effectively communicating the scientific knowledge through writing" (rated "good" or better).

These findings have informed the faculty of the areas of strength and improvement for both of these degrees. In the upcoming year, this information will lead assessment efforts in improving student learning in those courses contributing to areas of need.

Attached Files

[Faculty focus group rating of learning outcomes of graduate programs](#)

[LAS-BI-BIOLOGY-MS](#)

[Rebar-Darren-GB770-SP18.pdf](#)

[Rebar-Darren-GB771-SP18.pdf](#)

[Rebar-Darren-ZO530-SP18.pdf](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The Biological Sciences department has worked to build the assessment infrastructure for their 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans for the Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB) and Biology BS/BA and MA/MS programs. It will be important to follow through on the curriculum changes that have been identified as voids or shortcomings in the curriculum over multiple years of using the Praxis Major Field Test as the marquee assessment instrument for the program. The test result trends over time provide the evidence to substantiate the changes, the students who complete the program are the ones who will benefit the most by these changes. As your faculty study the retention trends for the department programs, it may be beneficial to know that some students may change their major after one semester or one year, and these students have a variety of reasons for doing so. There isn't a lot that can be changed other than retooling the entry level courses to accommodate a wider variety of learners with a wider band of prior academic preparation. This typically leads to more students retaining from year one to two. However, those students who are vested in the program for a couple of years, then change majors may be deterred by certain courses or pivotal points in the curriculum. You can use the course level success metrics (excel document) to identify those courses where students are struggling to be successful and identify strategies for improving these success metrics. There are multiple criteria for assessing these barriers which can be related to the distribution of the workload within the course, the expected rigor and content knowledge may not be aligned with courses that are prerequisites, the course sequencing may be out of order, and ineffective teaching, are a few reasons why students become unable to navigate the curriculum. Assessing and improving student learning in these identified barrier courses can be an effective use of time for improving student retention and overall success in the department's programs. I see the most pressing challenge for the faculty is their participation in assessing those courses identified for annual assessment within the 5-year plans. It appears that the rubrics for the MS programs have been completed or are close to completion and student works can now be scored using the rubrics. These capstone type experiences will be reported on annually, with the individual course embedded assessments occurring as identified in the years 2, 3, and 4 of the plans. Informing your faculty to do their course embedded assessment work will provide the information for confirming the commitment to using assessment to improve student learning. The assessment plan for the Forensics MS program needs more clarity on how the assessments will be completed and reported. With the goal of accrediting the program, the assessment practices and trend reports of these findings are a necessity to substantiate and meet the requirements for accreditation. The sooner this process is actualized, the better the

chances for the specialized accreditation recognition to occur. This past year has been a testament to the department's many changes and challenges (chair transition, BSE program transitions, and the KSDE reporting cycle taking up time to complete), however I see that progress is being made and the direction of the department's assessment efforts has been positive. Keep up this positive momentum, I'm encouraged by your overall efforts. Good things are on the horizon!

Academic Year 2017

The upcoming AY 2018 will be a year of challenges and opportunities for the department. The retirement of a long-standing faculty member will provide the opportunity to make some progress using assessment findings to move the BSE program forward as it adopts the new KSDE standards. The departments' contributions to educating highly competent biology teachers for the State of Kansas makes it a gem for both the college of Liberal Arts & Sciences and The Teachers College. Reinvigorating this program is an opportunity waiting to happen as the number of incoming students selecting biology as a major is one of the most popular majors chosen. It may benefit the department to prioritize assessment strategies on a few key courses that appear to be barrier courses to would be biology majors. There are a high number of students changing majors after the first through third semesters of study. It may also be fitting to look at the student success metrics for the general biology courses that all students must take as a requirement of the general education curriculum. The transition to a new chair can also identify opportunities to refocus assessment strategies. Although there are some potential change strategies mentioned, the biological sciences department has made some positive strides in their assessment practices over the past three years and is positioned to do great things as the Master of Forensics program moves forward to become accredited. It is recommended that the inclusion of as many faculty as possible in the assessment process will create a quality culture directed toward continuous improvement in the student learning experience.

Academic Year 2016

The assessment plan for the Biological Sciences department shows incremental improvement over the past two years. The curriculum mapping exercise enabled faculty to collaborate and discuss the curriculum alignment across courses for each of the specific degrees. The faculty also did some good focus group work to assess the quality of the master students' skills in meeting program level learning goals. Using this rubric and scoring student masters thesis works was a great way to see exactly where to focus future assessment and student learning improvement efforts. The data was informative in that it showed the areas where students were performing at a high level (writing about scientific knowledge) and also identified areas (developing verbal communication skills in presenting scientific research; research methodologies and analyses) for improvement in the Master of Arts program. Overall, the main impetus for the program level assessments is to develop more capacity, that is more faculty contributing to assessment of their courses across the board. The contributions that the department makes toward general education courses will be included in the general education assessment program which is undergoing some intentional revision to enhance student learning. The Biological Sciences department plays a key role in providing students' general education in the sciences. It is anticipated that department faculty will be contributing to these assessment efforts as well. I'll look forward to working with you in the upcoming months to provide assist in assessment design efforts for both programs and the general education curriculum in the department. Hang in there and keep encouraging faculty to contribute to assessment efforts!

Academic Year 2015

The assessment plan for the Biological Sciences department is a work in progress and including the KSDE report and associated files will bring a more concise picture of the overall assessment of the undergraduate programs as the BA/BS/BSE curricula are very closely aligned. Heading into the 2016 Academic Year with a detailed plan will be beneficial. Change in department chair leadership and the course load assignments left little time to dedicate towards defining and refining the departments assessment plan. A general biology lab course assignment was assessed as a part of a group effort in measuring students critical thinking skills. I have attached the results of this general education assessment and it can be reviewed to provide information to improve student learning of critical thinking skills. In addition, three Biology faculty members served as raters for the assessment project. These efforts and expertise are greatly appreciated. Going forward there are opportunities for faculty to focus student learning improvement strategies at the course level. It will be beneficial to share the changes made by using assessment results to inform both curriculum and pedagogy changes for improving student learning.

Providing Department: Biological Sciences

Responsible Roles: Kim Simons (E10238794), Tim Burnett (E10088151), Melissa Bailey (E10334934), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

RELATED ITEMS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology BMB

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

CH480/GB470 Capstone Report Seminar/Undergraduate Seminar

Summary 2018

Attached Files

[LAS-BI-BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY-BS](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

CH123 & 124 Chemistry I and Lab

GB140 & 141 principle of Biology and Lab

Summary 2018

Attached Files

[Powell-Alexis-GB140-SP18.pdf](#)

[Martin-Erica-GB141-SP18.pdf](#)

[Sievert-Lynnette-GB140-SP18.pdf](#)

[KC-B-CH124-SP18.pdf](#)

[Simons-K-CH123-SP18.pdf](#)

[Zhang-Q-CH123-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

CH 126 & 127 Chemistry II and Lab

CH 572 & 573 Organic Chemistry I and Lab

CH 574 & 575 Organic Chemistry II and Lab

MC350/351: Molecular and Cellular Biology and Lab

Summary 2019**Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:**

CH660/661 Biochemistry I and Lab

CH662 Biochemistry II

CH765 Advanced Biochem. Lab

MC 520 Molecular Genetics

MC 540&541 Cell Biology and Lab

MC549&550 Immunology and Lab

MC765 Advanced Biotechnology

Summary 2020**Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:**

Providing Department: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology BMB

Responsible Roles: Kim Simons (E10238794), Tim Burnett (E10088151)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Biology BS/BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

GB 480 Senior Experience in Biology: this is a capstone course for the Department of Biological Sciences in that students in their

senior year take a Major Field test. The average of total and sub-total scores will allow us to compare the proficiency in the subjects of biological sciences of ESU students with students from other U.S. institutions who take MFT.

Summary 2018

Attached Files

[LAS-BI-BIOLOGY-BS-BA](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

The courses assessed in 2017-2018 academic year:

GB 140 Principles of Biology
GB 141 Principles of Biology Lab
GB 170 Honors Biology and Lab
BO 212 Biology of Plants
BO 213 Biology of Plants Lab
ZO 214 Biology of Animals
ZO 215 Biology of Animals Lab

Summary 2018

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses assessed in 2018-2019 academic year:

BO 542 Plant Taxonomy
BO 543 Plant Taxonomy Lab
EB 480 Principles of Ecology
EB 481 Field Ecology
GB 425 General Genetics
GB 426 General Genetics Lab
MC 316 Microbiology
MC 317 Microbiology Lab
MC 350 Molecular and Cellular Biology
MC 351 Molecular and Cellular Biology Lab

Summary 2019

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses assessed in 2019-2020 academic year:

BO 750/751 Plant Anatomy and Physiology
EB 496 Stream Ecology and Lab
GB 510/511 Aquatic Biology
MC 540 Cell Biology
MC 541 Cell Biology Lab
MC 549 Immunology
ZO 440/441 Entomology
ZO472/473 Ichthyology
ZO 480/481 Ornithology
ZO 490/491 Mammology
ZO 717 Comparative Animal Physiology

Summary 2020

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Biology BS/BA

Responsible Roles: Tim Burnett (E10088151)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Biology MS/MA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

GB 890 Thesis (M.S. Thesis Option):

GB770/771 Graduate Seminar:

Summary of 2018

Attached Files

[LAS-BI-BIOLOGY-MS](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Courses assessed in 2017-2018 academic year:

Summary 2018

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses assessed in 2018-2019 academic year:

MC 520 Molecular Genetics

MC 540&541 Cell Biology and Lab

ZO 570 Mammalian Physiology

MC549 & 550 Immunology and Lab

Summary 2019

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses assessed in 2019-2020 academic year:

MC765 Advanced Biotechnology

ZO530 Animal behavior

GB809 Graduate Research Project

ZO840&841 Entomology and Lab

Summary 2020

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Biology MS/MA

Responsible Roles: Tim Burnett (E10088151)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Forensic Science MS**Start:** 07/01/2016**End:** 06/30/2022**Progress:** Ongoing over Multiple Years**Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:**

The courses used to assign credit hours related to the requirements for the thesis and oral exam are: FO886, FO809, FO890, FO803

These are course options that require a minimum of 3 credit hours dedicated to these course(s). Any of these three courses can be used to perform a Research Thesis or a Publication Quality report to fulfill the requirement. The assessment will be based on a rubric scored to the student work. In addition, an oral exam is given to the individual student's committee. These two types of assessment practices are used to ensure that graduates are competent in the student learning outcomes for the Forensics MS program.

Summary 2018

Type in your qualitative reflection

Summary 2019**Summary 2020****Summary 2021**

Attached Files

[LAS-BI-FORENSICS-MS](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

FO702

FO710

FO711

Summary 2019**Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:**

FO720

FO850

FO803

Summary 2020**Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:**

FO809

FO886

CH777

Summary 2021**Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:****Providing Department:** Forensic Science MS**Responsible Roles:** Tim Burnett (E10088151), Melissa Bailey (E10334934)

**UNIT REPORT****Assessment Report Communication & Theatre 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 10:37 AM

Communication and Theatre Assessment Plan**Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2019**

The communication program will monitor in particular two goals in SP 580 that were not rated significantly higher in 2018 ratings. One goal was 2a, "locate, comprehend, and summarize research from discipline." Items for 2a refer to how exhaustive the literature review represented in the poster was. Dr. Dennis will collaborate with students about the problem of abbreviating the literature review due to space constraints in the poster while also representing the magnitude of literature that was assessed, comprehend it, and summarized. The other goal that was not significantly higher in 2018 ratings than in 2017 ratings was goal 3, "follow ethical principles of the discipline." Consequently, Dr. Dennis' 201 instruction of the course will include prompting researchers to be more explicit and detailed in the inclusion of their ethical design principles within posters. Otherwise, course curriculum will continue to highlight research comprehension, synthesis, incorporation of communication theory and concepts, formulation of rationale for projects, and representation of results, as well as ethical practice of research with human subjects. Posters and projects created by 2017 students were rated by 2018 students with instructions to not so strongly encourage assessors to be critical. That practice will be continued in 2019 to facilitate fair comparisons between 2018 and 2019 ratings.

AY 2018

The communication program plans to continue to assess community partnerships in relationship to student learning using a 3 item open-ended survey design. Students in Small Group Communication SP 315 partner with organizations in the community to engage in service learning. After the service learning requirement is completed community partners are asked brief questions about the communication skills of the Small Group students.

The communication program also will continue to administer a 20-item scale constructed for the purpose of assessment in the Capstone course in research methods, SP 580: Analysis of Communication Studies. The scale is completed by current students as they rate the final project posters of the previous year's Capstone teams. Between two and six items represent each of the department's Goals 2a (i.e., locate, comprehend, and summarize research from discipline), 2b (i.e., synthesize extant communication research), 2c (i.e., describe and apply communication concepts and theories), 2d (i.e., formulate and support argument), and 2e (i.e., present research competently), and 3 (i.e., follow ethical principles of the discipline). To date, overall scores on the seven-point Likert scale of agreement have improved significantly from one year to the next for all but one of the four years of this assessment.

The communication program plans to continue to use the Oral Communication Value Rubric (from the AACU) to measure student learning in five areas: organization, language, delivery, supporting materials, and central message. Each of the areas is rated on criteria judged to be 1 for benchmark, 2 or 3 for milestones, or 4 for capstone. We have been using this for several semesters now and have found it to be a valuable assessment tool. Multiple instructors across multiple sections will apply the rubric to 1-2 speeches per section, and then plan to use the findings to continue to improve student learning in their courses. Additionally, collected data also will be used to inform broader program assessment and discussions about SP 101: Public Speaking course.

AY 2017

In SP 580, Analysis of Communication Studies (the capstone course in research methods), students will engage in team projects comprised of complete research projects manifested in document and poster formats. Each student will evaluate a poster from the previous year's poster session on a seven-point Likert scale of agreement for 20 items. The items will each represent assessment of the Communication program's second and third learning goals and outcomes. Based on the scores, a determination will be made in how material will be presented to the next year's class to improve results in areas such as identification and incorporation of communication theory in their literature reviews and rationales for research questions and hypotheses based on their literature review, so as to better represent arguments for conducting their projects.

AY2016

Faculty members in the Department of Communication and Theatre developed and communicated course level student learning outcomes for use in their syllabi, planning, and assessment.

The communication faculty members reviewed and discussed their Bachelor of Science and their Bachelor of Arts degree programs in communication and aligned the program learning objectives with course level student learning outcomes to complete the curriculum mapping task.

"What is one thing we want to improve with our academic program?" Answer = We want our students to become more adept at describing communication concepts and theories and applying them to programmatic realities.

"What information are we going to gather to be able to measure if improvement occurred?" Answer = We are going to analyze the final projects in our communication capstone course and the final projects and presentations in our Persuasion course.

AY2015

We will be expanding our assessment of Outcome 3a, which will align Outcome 3a into other Communication courses in the program. Capstone students will again evaluate the research project posters produced by the previous year's students. The analysis of that data will be especially interesting for items measuring Goal 2d (i.e., "formulate and support argument") and Goal 3 (i.e., "follow ethical principles of the discipline"). Those are the only goals that did not feature significant improvement from the previous year to the current year, so instructions to augment posters with rationales for projects and ethical considerations have been added to the poster assignment.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2017 - AY 2018

Until the previous comparison of 2017 raters to 2016 raters, assessment results have always indicated that the pedagogy of SP 580 is improving on a yearly basis. That trend of improvement has reappeared with the comparison of 2018 and 2017 raters.

One of only two goals to not be rated significantly higher in 2018 ratings was goal, 2a, "locate, comprehend, and summarize research from discipline." Items for 2a refer to how exhaustive the literature review represented in the poster was. Dr. Dennis will collaborate with students in 2019 about the problem of abbreviating the literature review due to space constraints in the poster while also representing the magnitude of literature that was accessed, comprehended, and summarized.

The other goal that was not significantly higher in 2018 ratings than in 2017 ratings was goal 3, "follow ethical principles of the discipline." Consequently, Dr. Dennis' 2019 instruction of the course will include prompting researchers to be more explicit and detailed in the inclusion of their ethical design principles within posters.

Otherwise, course curriculum will continue to highlight research comprehension, synthesis, incorporation of communication theory and concepts, formulation of rationale for projects, and representation of results, as well as ethical practice of research with human subjects.

AY 2016 - AY 2017

The department has compiled data to specifically assess its goals 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e, and 3 across the first five-years of the current iteration of the capstone course, SP 580, Analysis of Communication Studies. Comparison of successive generations of students has demonstrated significant progress and improvement across the goals from year to year in all cases but one. One of the most notable gains has been in students' abilities to convey their implementation of ethical research practices. The immediate objective of the next phase of this assessment is to determine whether a recent downturn was an outlier or indicates that scores had previously reached a plateau.

AY 2016 - AY 2015

These past 2 years have been years of transition in our assessment. Due to the fact that some assessment data we gathered was not useful, we have made modifications. Our assessment goals are viable and important as we continue trying new things to assess. The piecemeal approach of assessing Goals 2 and 3 with different measures for SP 312 and SP 370C has been replaced by the concurrent assessment of Goals 2 and 3 with the poster evaluation process within SP 580. Moreover, the research poster assignment in SP 580 is far more relevant to the actual skills represented by the goals than the synthesis paper in SP 312 and the pre-test/post-test quiz in SP 370C were.

Attached Files

[Program Review Indicators - COMMUNICATION and THEATRE 2014](#)

[Program Review Indicators - COMMUNICATION and THEATRE 2015](#)

- [Program Review Indicators - COMMUNICATION and THEATRE 2016](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2015 Data and Analysis](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2015 Reflection](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2015 Subsequent Steps](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2016 Data and Analysis](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2016 Reflection](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2016 Subsequent Steps](#)
- [COM-TH_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Communication and Theatre - AY2017](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - COMMUNICATION and THEATRE 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Communication and Theatre - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - COMMUNICATION and THEATRE 2018](#)

Program Name: Communication BS

Summary of Program Assessments:

Academic Year 2017

This past year assessment efforts were extended toward general education assessments for the interpersonal communication and public speaking courses as the General Education Assessment Team 2017 focused on core skills. These efforts included a key faculty member serving on the GEAT and other faculty providing course embedded assessments and reporting for their courses taught. The assessment results for students in the SP580 capstone course are uploaded in the file library for the 5-year assessment cycle plan for the communication BS degree. These assessment results were summarized previously in the summary and next steps area. In the 2018 academic year there are additional courses added to the course embedded assessment plan in addition to the capstone assessments.

Academic Year 2016

Student Learning Goal assessments were conducted in SP580 - Analysis of Communication Studies (Goal 2a-2e and Goal 3).

SP580 - Analysis of Communication Studies

This capstone course in research methods requires students to participate in team research projects and presentation of conference-level posters. The students also participate in the evaluation of the previous year's poster projects. Having students participate in assessing other's work develops evaluative skills that provide insight into their own research. The findings showed that, when comparing sum scores from 2016 to those from 2015, scores for items representing goals 2a, 2b, 2e, and goal 3, as well as all items in toto, were significantly higher in 2016 and higher, though not significantly so, for items representing goals 2c and 2d. This confirms that the pedagogical changes are successful and faculty will continue to monitor students' results to insure student success in this capstone course.

Academic Year 2015

Student Learning Goal assessments were conducted in the following courses: SP312 - Theories of Communication (Goals 2c, 2d and 2e); SP370 - Communication and Sports (Goal 2a); SP362 - Social Movements (Goal 3a); and SP580 - Analysis of Communication Studies (Goal 2a-2e and Goal 3).

SP312 - Theories of Communication

Findings showed that the Goals 2c - Describe communication concepts and theories and apply them to pragmatic realities, 2d - Formulate argument and support it, and 2e - Present research competently orally and in writing showed mean scores ranging from 20 to 25 on a 25-point scale for the eight items being measured. These data have been being assessed and continuous strategies employed to improve student learning from 2008-2013. It has been determined that this assessment routine has run its course and the faculty will transition assessments to SP580 - Analysis of Communication Studies (the Capstone course) to identify opportunities to improve student learning.

SP370 - Communication and Sports

Findings showed that Goal 2a - Locate, comprehend, and summarize existing research in the discipline pre-test and post-test scores improved from mean scores of 4.625 to 6.25 on a scale of 10. The paired-sample *t*-test indicated significant improvement at $p < .004$ level. However these gains are not considered to suffice. The strategy to enhance student learning includes the faculty decision to re-establish SP 580 - Analysis of Communication Studies as a core requirement for Communication majors.

SP362 - Social Movements

The assessments in this course involve students engaging in peer review of assigned papers and are currently ongoing. This includes emphasis on citation, editing, and plagiarism. The data collection began in the Fall 2012 semester and in fall 2014, faculty decided to use a rubric to further evaluate students' abilities in these topics while identifying strengths and weaknesses to focus improvement strategies.

These assessments are in progress to capture enough data to substantiate student learning effectiveness. Data will continue to be analyzed and improvement strategies will be implemented as data show warranted.

SP580 - Analysis of Communication Studies

This capstone course in research methods requires students to participate in team research projects and presentations. The students also participate in the evaluation of peer projects. Having students participate in assessing others works develops evaluative skills that provide insight into their own research. The findings showed that comparing sum scores from 2013, to 2014 and to 2015, that scores for goals 2a, 2b, 2c, 2e, and goal 3 were significantly higher in 2015. This confirms that the pedagogical changes are successful and faculty will continue to monitor students results to insure student success in this capstone course.

Attached Files

- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2015 Data and Analysis](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2015 Reflection](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2015 Subsequent Steps](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2016 Data and Analysis](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2016 Reflection](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2016 Subsequent Steps](#)
- [Core Outcomes SP 101 2016 Data and Analysis](#)
- [Core Outcomes SP 101 2016 Reflection](#)
- [Core Outcomes SP 101 2016 Subsequent Steps](#)
- [Goal 2a SP 370c Data and Analysis](#)
- [Goal 2a SP 370c Reflection](#)
- [Goal 2a SP 370c Subsequent Steps](#)
- [Goal 2c 2d 2e SP 312 Data and Analysis](#)
- [Goal 2c 2d 2e SP 312 Reflection](#)
- [Goal 2c 2d 2e SP 312 Subsequent Steps](#)
- [Goal 3 SP362](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 Reflection](#)
- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 Subsequent Steps](#)

Program Name: Speech and Theatre BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The Department of Communication and Theatre faculty consistently discusses the curriculum for our BSE candidates. While we have 12-16 declared BSE candidates at any given time that number drops significantly prior to program completion for two major reasons. One is that some of the students do not make it through the teacher education program due to lower grades than the program requires; the larger issue is that when our theatre majors and debaters, in particular, see that there are options other than teaching at the secondary level, they opt for a change in career paths. Most of those teacher education candidates stay majors within our department, they change degree plans. We certainly retain them as majors in our department; they just change their degree program. These students generally see themselves as "either - or" rather than comprehensive. They prefer public speaking and debate/forensics with little regard or interest in studying theatre OR prefer theatre with little regard or understanding of the communication/speech side. The Speech and Theatre content area is broad and the content knowledge and skill set is sometimes overwhelming to those in the earlier states of the program. The program coordinator and departmental faculty members emphasize that our teacher education candidates MUST be proficient in all of the licensure areas, not one or the other. Candidates not confident or simply not interested in taking classes in both disciplines, self-select out of the BSE and into one of the options: BA in communication or theatre; BS in communication; or BFA in theatre.

We have to justify offering classes with small enrollments and, at the same time, force students into taking the courses with historically small enrollment (SP 222 Argumentation and Debate; SP 470 Teaching of Speech and Theatre; SP 572 Directing Forensics Activities) at a time that may not be best for the student (it may be "out of sequence") or the integrity of the program. If a sophomore does not take the courses, graduation could be delayed one full year since we are offering the course every four semesters, and they must be completed before student teaching. We are generally offering SP 222 every fall because our faculties are able to advise other students into that course but that sometimes changes; we are offering SP 470 and SP 572 every four semesters. The result of the infrequent offering is that we might have to enroll a sophomore who really does not have the foundation necessary for the upper level methods courses, but we cannot risk the class being cancelled. We have tried the "independent study" route, but collaboration is missing from that model of delivery for these two courses.

There are two required courses that have not been offered within the time of this report. TH 340 Play Production and SP 329 Principles of Broadcasting are not being offered because we lost the faculty who taught those courses, and there is no optimism about faculty positions being filled soon. Perhaps a larger issue is that even if we do get those positions, we may not be able to find the right person to teach those specific courses. We have found 'suitable' substitutes, but we are consistently not offering two courses that are required in our BSE. A broad theatre elective is substituted for Play Production and must be approved by the Theatre faculty as well as our BSE coordinator. Mass Communication, a journalism course that is offered by the Department of

English, Journalism, and Modern Languages every semester, In fact, multiple sections of that course are offered each semester. That particular course adequately covers the necessary content information for our licensure area. The course description for JO 200 Mass Communication: A survey of the history, scope, influence, and problems of the mass media: books, newspapers, magazines, movies, television, radio, public relations, and advertising. The topic areas in the broad survey course align with the necessary state standard. "Standard 3. The teacher of speech/theatre has practical content knowledge in teaching and critically evaluating mass media."

Several areas of collaboration have continued:

We have discussions about the areas of the Praxis II that are our weakest areas.

Those areas drive changes we are making. We know that quite a few of our students take their public speaking course either as concurrent high school credit or at a community college. We make sure that oral presentations are a significant part of several of the required courses in our BSE curriculum.

We look specifically at the Praxis scores in the areas of Play Production and Broadcasting because those are the two courses that we do not offer; theatre provides a couple of approved substitutions for the Play Production course and we substitute JO 200 Mass Communication for the Principles of Broadcasting. The Praxis II has very few questions about play production; the Praxis II scores in the area of broadcasting and media are actually higher than when students were taking our departmental class. We believe that is because the questions are more about the historical aspect and the FCC than practical application. We will be having the discussion of making the JO 200 course the required course for our BSE.

4. We are strengthening our rubrics for Assessment #6 to evaluate the teaching unit portfolio and align that major assignment with all six of our state standards. If our candidates have an area/areas for improvement within our discipline, we want the rubric to reflect a "plan of action" to remediate those weaker areas.
5. We need to include more direction and assignments about Reflecting because that area of the TWS is consistently one of our lower scores as a group.

Academic Year 2017

The KSDE report and supporting files are shown in the file library. The program report provides the information supporting assessment efforts and completers success. Section V of the KSDE Current Annual Program Report (file library) provides the details of confirming program success and how assessment findings are used to implement strategies to improve student learning.

SP 490 Teaching of Speech and Theatre (the methods course) was not taught Spring 2017. It is only taught every other Spring Semester. It was taught last Spring 2016 and will be taught again in Spring 2018.

The teaching unit will continue to be designed to give students an opportunity to develop an entire nine-week plan of study in two distinct areas. One unit must be in the speech area; the second must be in the theatre area. The grading rubric emphasizes content and knowledge. The students will continue with the assignment of two fifty-minute teaching presentations. One of the teaching presentations must be from the speech/debate/media area of the content and the second presentation must be from the theatre content area. Emphasis is placed on the CONTENT of the presentation with considerations and discussions about the pedagogy of teaching.

All assignments are in alignment with KSDE Speech and Theatre Standards.

In the Spring 2016, SP 490 Teaching of Speech and Theatre course, all but one student will finish their BSE. That one student chose a different path.

In the Spring of 2018 a new set of BSE students will enroll in the course.

Academic Year 2016

SP 490 Teaching of Speech and Theatre, the methods course. Taught every other spring semester. Last taught, Spring 2015.

The Portfolio/Teaching Units are completed by candidates as the culminating assignments in SP 490 Teaching of Speech and Theatre, the methods course. The teaching unit is designed to give students an opportunity to develop an entire nine week plan of study in two distinct areas. One unit must be in the speech area; the second must be in the theatre area. The grading rubric emphasizes content and knowledge. Candidates must select one lesson to teach from each of the two units.

Alignment with KSDE Speech and Theatre Standards:

The assessment aligns with the Standards 1, 2, and 4 because each candidate must effectively communicate content knowledge when completing the written and oral requirements of the assessment. Standard #1: The teacher of speech/theatre has practical knowledge and skills in teaching and critically evaluating intrapersonal, interpersonal, small group communication, public speaking, listening, and communication theory. Standard #2: The teacher of speech/theatre has practical content knowledge and skills in teaching and critically

evaluating debate and forensic co-curricular activities. Standard #4: The teacher of speech/theatre has practical content knowledge and skills in teaching and critically evaluating technical theatre, design, history, dramatic literature, performance techniques, and directing.

Two fifty minute teaching presentations are required of the candidates in the SP 470 course, Teaching of Speech and Theatre. Both presentations should be a “first day of class” kind of lesson, One of the teaching presentations must be from the speech/debate/media area of the content and the second presentation must be from the theatre content area. A complete written lesson plan is required at least one week in advance of completing the presentation. Emphasis is placed on the CONTENT of the presentation with considerations and discussions about the pedagogy of teaching. The rubric is “excellent”, “average” and “needs attention” evaluation. List the five things being assessed. Give the criteria for success for the program (i.e., passing percentage.)

Alignment with KSDE Speech and Theatre Standards:

This comprehensive assignment addresses general knowledge of the units of the discipline and the ability of the candidate to collaborate with others. Standard #1: The teacher of speech/theatre has practical knowledge and skills in teaching and critically evaluating intrapersonal, interpersonal, small group communication, public speaking, listening, and communication theory.

Standard #2: The teacher of speech/theatre has practical content knowledge and skills in teaching and critically evaluating debate and forensic co-curricular activities.

Standard #4: The teacher of speech/theatre has practical content knowledge and skills in teaching and critically evaluating technical theatre, design, history, dramatic literature, performance techniques, and directing.

Standard #5: The teacher of speech/theatre has practical content knowledge and skills, needed in managing theatrical presentations in collaboration with others.

Examples of assessments include comprehensive examinations, projects, comprehensive portfolio tasks and score/s aligned to standards OR the option of submitting course grades-based assessment related to content knowledge evaluation. If submitting course grades-based assessment, the detailed description must clearly delineate the alignment of the course description and assessments to the standard that is assessed during the course in order to assure that the course grade reflects candidate knowledge of the standard. Describe course key activities, projects, assessments that show specificity to the standard. If course grades are used, include the program or unit definition of grades in the narrative. If the course grades-based assessments are used as evidence for meeting two standards, the course key assessments’ data (exams, projects, portfolio tasks) must be disaggregated in a data table for each of the two standards. This is necessary to provide evidence of meeting each standard. This narrative must state the proficiency level or grade acceptable by the program

Comprehensive written examination over the broad areas of theatre because theatre faculty believes content knowledge is theatre ia unique. The examination was written by the theatre faculty members who teach the BSE core theatre courses.

Description

Candidates take a faculty generated theatre comprehensive exam in SP 470. Candidates must score at least 70% on the exam. A retake examination is available. (An item analysis is done on the results of the examination to ascertain what needs to be retaught. Many courses within our core curriculum require small group work and public speaking so those areas are integrated in several or many courses.

Alignment with Standards:

Standard #4 The teacher of speech/theatre has practical content knowledge and skills in teaching and critically evaluating technical theatre, design, history, dramatic literature, performance techniques, and directing.

Attached Files

- [Assignment Plan](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table Student Teaching 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 6 Date Table KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Tables KSDE 2014-2017 \(1\)](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Tables KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Praxis II Content-PLT Exams](#)
- [Assessment 2 b KPTP Template](#)

- [Assessment 2 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 2 Tasks 1 and 2 for KPTP](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Tables--2016-2017](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 4 KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Assessment 5 Course Grade in Play Directing 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 5 Syllabus Play Directing 2014-17](#)
- [Assessment 6 Teaching Unit Grades in Teaching of Speech and Theatre 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 7 Exam Scores for Department Comprehensive Test 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 8 Theatre Exam 2014-2017](#)
- [LAS-CT-SPEECH AND THEATRE-BSE](#)
- [Assessment 7 SP 470 Content Examination for Communication \(003\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Praxis II Content-PLT Exams.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 b KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Tables--2016-2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Tasks 1 and 2 for KPTP.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table KSDE 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Course Grade in Play Directing 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Syllabus Play Directing 2014-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table TH 426 Grades 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Teaching Unit Grades in Teaching of Speech and Theatre 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 SP 470 Content Examination for Theatre 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessments 2 and 4 TWS Scoring Rubric 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [BSE Degree Requirements Speech and Theatre.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE SpeechTheatre 2014-2017.docx](#)

Program Name: Theatre BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

Academic Year 2017

The Theatre BA program has been transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan and the distribution of courses to be assessed in AY 2018 are shown. The curriculum in the Theatre BA curriculum is aligned with the Theatre BSE program and the common courses are either assessed in the BSE or the BA programs, respectively. The information on the course assessment cycle is presented in the 5-year assessment plan and the support documents are uploaded in the file library.

Attached Files

- [LAS-CT-THEATRE-BA](#)

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The comprehensive assessment of the capstone SP580 course and the affiliated assessments of the poster projects by students in the major has been productive. It has provided direction for strategic changes in the curriculum and pedagogy. The use of statistical analysis has proven that changes in student achievements and performance has significantly improved in most areas. Those areas (presentation of the comprehensive literature review and ethics of the discipline) identified for improvement and strategic change in the upcoming 2019 academic year are aligned with the comprehensive skill sets necessary for professionals in the communication fields. If you are looking to put a different spin on what you are currently doing, it may be beneficial to have the students work on a draft version of their initial design prior to reviewing what the previous cohorts of students have done. You may have some new creative directions emerge in the poster designs, then introduce the students into the analysis and judging of the works of the previous cohorts. It may evolve the process in some

new directions, meanwhile still being able to use the existing process that has proven to be beneficial in identifying the strengths and opportunities in the existing learning experiences.

The challenges facing students success in the Theatre BSE program and adaptations being employed to provide options for courses is to be commended. The barriers of the frequency that courses can be offered and the existing situation with faculty voids makes student navigation of the curriculum difficult. At a point in time when we are working to provide pathways for students to complete programs in a timely manner, this is certainly an example of where we have opportunities to re-think how we have our curriculum designed. The examples you provide explaining how students are pressed into taking upper division courses required for the major at a vulnerable point in their academic progressions is noted. Your assessment data shows that student performance on the Praxis examination is adequate in most areas and those areas of challenge are being addressed with the optional courses.

The contributions of the faculty to the assessment of the general education program has benefited the program at the both the goal (core skills 1.b - oral communication) and the individual course levels. The individual efforts of Kenna Reeves in her multi-year assessment of the SP101 course has greatly improved student learning in her sections. And, the combined efforts of Heidi Hamilton, Michael Dennis, and Tennley Vic have shown to improve student success in both the SP101 and SP100. Teresa Mitchell's contributions to assessing the the Theatre Appreciation course TH105 will improve the student learning experience, as well.

The assessment reports for the Theatre BA program are lagging behind as the capstone course and year 2 through 4 course assessment sequences have been listed, but there wasn't any feedback written on the 5-year assessment template for the program. One area to work on is to ensure that the faculty are assessing their courses and reporting findings as assigned in the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans. With the integration of new faculty and this new assessment cycle, it is important for faculty to know when and how the assessment reporting is planned out across all the years in the 5-year cycle. Continued faculty assessment efforts are greatly appreciated, and Dr. Michael Dennis's recognition as an assessment champion for 2018 was much deserved! Your department faculty are great to work with and make valuable contributions to improving student learning!

Academic Year 2017

The Communication and Theatre department continues to embrace assessment practices through the inclusion of the faculty and chair in all of their processes. It is encouraging to see the growth in the assessment planning that has occurred for the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plans and the inclusion of the assessment of the general education courses within these plans. The outstanding efforts of the faculty in serving on the General Education Assessment Team and the course embedded assessments scored to the AAC&U Value Rubric for Oral Communication are greatly appreciated. These contributions have shown precision and efficacy in improving the student learning experience in oral communication and have also provided key information for goal level assessments of the general education program. It is always a pleasure working with the Communication and Theatre department faculty and chair as their commitments and expertise directed towards assessment practices are genuine and meaningful. The planning and implementation of the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plans are almost complete with the exception of the courses to be assessed in years two, three, and four for the Theatre BA program. These courses will need to be identified and entered into the 5-Year assessment plan template accordingly. It is assumed that this process is now occurring with faculty back on campus for the fall 2018 term. Thank you in advance for your time and expertise in the upcoming year with implementing course embedded assessments into the 5-year plans! Keep up the excellent assessment work!

Academic Year 2016

The assessment plan for the department including the completion of the curricular mapping, course embedded student learning outcomes, and the overall goal of students becoming more adept at describing communication concepts and theories and applied learning was a highly productive strategy. The changes made in both the course and assignments being assessed shows that the faculty are making methodical decisions and have identified where the student learning is measured with the greatest accuracy. This type of assessment work will inform not only student learning in the courses assessed, but will also inform other courses which contribute to the program level student learning outcomes. Be sure to engage all faculty when discussing these assessment findings and engage in genuine dialogue about how each course in the major contributes to these capstone skills. Ask faculty, where they want to focus upcoming assessment efforts. Have faculty develop a plan before hand to use assessment as a tool to try to improve something that they believe would improve overall student learning.

For the upcoming year, it will be important to engage the Theatre faculty in participation in the overall department level learning improvement plan. The Theatre BA and BSE programs didn't complete their respective areas in the template, thus leaving a void for your department. Although Kansas Department of Education cycles on a three year review, it is important that the annual assessment efforts be noted in the assessment plan and for evidence files to be uploaded to provide the proper recognition for assessment efforts being done. If possible, I would like to meet with the Chair and faculty assessment leaders for the Theatre programs, so we can work to get this process confirmed and to provide any assistance that may be beneficial to the faculty. Overall, the progress being made in assessing the communication programs and the general education program contributions is coming along quite well. It is evident that the faculty are working together on common themes and this is fabulous, the best assessment work will come from these practices.

Academic Year 2015 The assessment work done by the Communication and Theatre department is sound and results are being used to improve student learning. The intentionality of transforming the course level assessments and recognizing when to move on to new courses is encouraging. This is the sign of a well thought plan with faculty engagement driving the direction of the improvement strategies. Your use of the meta-rubric to tie together the important parts of assessing including engaging students and faculty, the use of data, and responding to change in a timely manner are strengths. Continue to complete assessment works, attach evidence and write the summary reports for the Speech and Theatre BSE and the Theatre BA programs. It is recognized that there will be many commonalities between these programs and repetition in both areas isn't expected. Write to the unique parts of the curriculum in the BA program and include the KSDE assessment reports and affiliated files in the BSE program area. Overall, your faculty have done good work and it is encouraging. You position the department and programs to successfully go forward continuously improving the student learning experience.

Attached Files

- [Communication & Theatre Meta Rubric Results 2015](#)
- [General Education Course Embedded Assessment Hamilton](#)
- [Oral Communication Rubric for 2016 Assessments - Data](#)
- [Assessment Oral Comm Rubric Table fall 2015 - Changes to the AAC&U Rubric](#)
- [Oral Communication Assessments - Hamilton Spring 2016](#)
- [ASSESSMENT Summary for AACU Oral Comm VALUE Rubric AY 2016](#)
- [ASSESSMENT Summary for AACU Oral Comm VALUE Rubric AY 2018.pdf](#)
- [Oral Communication Rubric for 2017 Assessments -Data 5-22-2018.xlsx](#)
- [ASSESSMENT Summary for AACU Oral Comm VALUE Rubric AY 2017.pdf](#)
- [Oral Communication Rubric for 2017 Assessments - Data 6-20-2017.xlsx](#)

Providing Department: Communication and Theatre

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Responsible Roles:

Jennifer Newell (E10328169), Heidi Hamilton (E10000169), Michael Dennis (E10336044), Steve Catt (E10000942), Joan Brewer (E10000569), Sheryl Lidzy (E10322439), Kenna Reeves (E10000557)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Communication BA

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

AY2017

COMMUNICATION MAJOR CAPSTONE COURSE (SP 580)

SEE UPLOADED DATA AND ANALYSIS FILE

Students in the 2017 section of SP 580 rated 2016 posters *significantly* lower than students in the 2016 section of SP 580 rated 2015 posters on items operationalizing goals:

- 2a, "locate, comprehend, and summarize research from discipline."
- 2b, "synthesize extant communication research."
- 2c, "describe and apply communication concepts and theories."
- 2e, "present research competently."
- 3, "follow ethical principles of the discipline."

Engaging students in the assessment process in SP 580, Analysis of Communication Studies (the capstone course in research methods), gives them insight as to the expectations for their own research projects and posters and serves to improve their performance.

Until this year, assessment results indicated that the pedagogy of SP 580 is improving on a yearly basis.

One of three factors seems likely to explain this reversal in trends wherein scores were almost exclusively significantly lower than those from the previous year:

- 1) The 2017 students were encouraged to be honest and critical in their assessments to an extent that students from the past years were

not.

2) The 2017 students exhibited their comprehension and appreciation of published research processes presented throughout the semester in the form of higher standards for research presented as posters.

3) The 2016 students, whose posters were assessed by the 2017 students, displayed less evidence in their posters of their attainment of goals 2a, 2b, 2c, 2e, and 3 than did the 2015 students.

4) The 2015 students, assessed in 2016, may represent a plateau as they far outperformed both the 2014 and 2106 students.

Finally, as the latest round of assessment did not indicate a significant downturn for the items used to operationalize goal 2d, "formulate and support argument," the most recent students assessed at least presented good rationales for performing their projects within their posters.

Course curriculum will continue to highlight research comprehension, synthesis, incorporation of communication theory and concepts, formulation of rationale for projects, representation of results, and ethical practice of research with human subjects.

In the next round of assessment data collection, Spring 2018, wherein posters and projects created by 2017 students, instructions will be modified so as to not so strongly encourage assessors to be critical.

Summary 2018

Attached Files

- [Goals 2a 2b 2c 2d 2e 3 SP 580 2017 Data and Analysis](#)
- [LAS-CT-COMMUNICATION-BA](#)
- [Catt-Steve-SP303-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Dennis-Michael-SP312-FA17.pdf](#)
- [All Comm and Theatre Department Assessment Reports Combined-AY18.pdf](#)
- [Dennis-Michael-SP580-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Dennis-Michael-SP100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hamilton-Heidi-SP100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Dennis-Michael-SP101-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hamilton-Heidi-SP101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Hamilton-Heidi-SP101h-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hamilton-Heidi-SP312-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Mitchell-Theresa-SP101-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Vik-Tennley-SP315-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Williams-Susan-SP470-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Vik-Tennley-SP100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Lohkamp-Chris-TH131-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

2018 Summary

For SP 100, Interpersonal Communication, students watched the movie "When Harry Met Sally" to find examples of coarse terms and concepts. Students were guided in writing a structured paper about concepts from the course. Students were to define biological sex, gender, and gender roles. After defining each of these three terms in their paper, students were to pick a concept from the column related to the term and define/describe that concept. Students were then asked to write about an example from the movie that demonstrated the concept and term they picked. International students perform much better on the paper, however, native English speakers reported they did not look at the information on canvas and subsequently the class average fell. In the future a paper handout of expectations will be provided in class.

In SP101, Public Speaking, students chose a topic that is difficult for their peers to understand and constructed an explanation speech to enhance comprehension of it. Their performances were assessed utilizing the Association of American Colleges and Universities' Oral Communication Value Rubric. Students in selected 2017-2018 of SP 101, on average, exhibited upper milestone level ability on the AAC&U rubric to deliver (KBOR outcome 3) their explanation speeches, wield language (KBOR outcome 2) and provide supporting

material (KBOR outcomes 1 and 2). The nearly reached milestone levels for both organizing their speeches (KBOR outcome 2) and conveying central messages (KBOR outcome 2) appropriately and effectively.

For SP 580, in light of the significant decreases in ratings from the 2016 to 2017 ratings, the assessment reflections and subsequent steps reports last year included the vow, "in the next round of assessment data collection, Spring 2018, wherein posters and projects created by 2017 students will be rated, instructions will be modified so as to not so strongly encourage assessors to be critical." That practice will be continued in 2019 to facilitate fair comparisons between 2018 and 2019 ratings.

The case used in SP 303 provided valuable insight into a way to improve learning of a key concept in the course. Through the use of the case, demonstrated learning of the key concept improved.

The next time SP 312 is taught, it will be an online course. Some of the learning improvement strategies incorporated this semester will not work, such as the discussion of answers and review sessions, in the same way. In the online course, more practice activities as possible "homework" assignments or discussion board posts could be utilized from the start of the course.

In SP 315, community partners had positive assessments of the students' spoken communication. In the future, the kinds of spoken communication skills we are looking for in our majors could be addressed more specifically and our community partners could be asked to observe those skills.

The courses to be assessed the second year are:

- SP100-Interpersonal Communication (general education)
- SP101-Public Speaking (general education)
- SP580-Analysis of Communication Research (capstone course)
- SP303-Organizational Communication
- SP312-Theories of Communication
- SP315-Small Group Communication
- SP500-Conflict Resolution

**Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:
2019 Summary**

The courses to be assessed the third year are:

- SP100-Interpersonal Communication (general education)
- SP101-Public Speaking (general education)
- SP580-Analysis of Communication Research (capstone course)
- SP306-Advanced Interpersonal Communication
- SP307-Advanced Public Speaking
- SP313-Interviewing: Techniques and Principles

**Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:
2020 Summary**

The courses to be assessed the fourth year are:

- SP100-Interpersonal Communication (general education)
- SP101-Public Speaking (general education)
- SP580-Analysis of Communication Research (capstone course)
- SP332-Theories of Persuasion

SP350-Intercultural Communication

SP403-Communication Training and Development

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Responsible Roles:

Heidi Hamilton (E10000169), Michael Dennis (E10336044), Steve Catt (E10000942), Sheryl Lidzy (E10322439), Kenna Reeves (E10000557)

Providing Department: Communication BA

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Theatre BA

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Professor Jim Bartruff and the Theatre faculty will decide on the sequencing of the courses to be assessed during years two, three, and four. The courses that must be assessed during each of the reporting years are the capstone course and the general education course.

The courses that were assessed every year is:

TH401-Senior Capstone

TH105-Theatre Appreciation

2018 Summary

Attached Files

[LAS-CT-THEATRE-BA](#)

[Mitchell-Theresa-TH121-FA17.pdf](#)

[Mitchell-Theresa-TH105-SP18.pdf](#)

[Bartruff-Jim-TH472-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Professor Jim Bartruff and the Theatre faculty will decide on the sequencing of the courses to be assessed during years two, three, and four. The courses that must be assessed during each of the reporting years are the capstone course and the general education course.

2018 Summary

The courses to be assessed the second year are:

TH 101 Introduction to Theatre

TH 121 Acting One

TH 131 Stagecraft

TH 132 Stagecraft Lab

TH 401 Senior Capstone

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Professor Jim Bartruff and the theatre faculty will decide on the sequencing of the courses to be assessed during years two, three, and four. The courses that must be assessed during each of the reporting years are the capstone course and the general education course.

2019 Summary

The courses to be assessed the third year are:

TH 210 Movement for Actors

TH 223 Voice and Diction

TH 350 Intro to Theatrical Design

TH 381 Survey of Dramatic Literature

TH 382 Modern Drama

TH 454 Costume Design

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Professor Jim Bartruff and the theatre faculty will decide on the sequencing of the courses to be assessed during years two, three, and four. The courses that must be assessed during each of the reporting years are the capstone course and the general education course.

2020 Summary

The courses to be assessed the fourth year are:

TH 221 Acting II

TH 351 History of Costume and Decor

TH 390/391 Theatre History

TH 426 Play Directing

TH 457 Scene Design

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Responsible Roles:

Jim Bartruff (E10087831), Steve Catt (E10000942), Kenna Reeves (E10000557), Susie Williams (E10258005), Nancy Pontius (E10000056)

Providing Department: Theatre BA

UNIT REPORT

Assessment Report English, Modern Languages & Journalism 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 10:43 AM

**English, Modern Languages, and Journalism Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY2018**

The department focused on a number of assessment initiatives this past year (Spring, Summer, and Fall 2017)

--The department developed a Five-Year Assessment Cycle, and the department plans to assess a number of upper-level (500-level) courses this year.

--Composition I and II portfolio assessment continues, and is now in its fifth year. Both faculty and graduate teaching assistants collaborate in scoring student essays, using a rubric devised by our Composition Director and Composition Committee.

--The department is beginning to evaluate results from our pilot assessment based on the BA (in English) Assessment proposal. Student papers from two points in the program (one early in the BA and one late in the BA program). This was done to track student learning progress and program strengths and weaknesses. The papers were evaluated using a portfolio system.

--Assessment for the Writing Center/English Language Learners Lab continued to be more robust, detailed, and quantified under the center's new director, Joelle Spotswood, now in her second year. Along with recent changes made to the Academic Center for Excellence and Success (ACES) reporting methods are becoming more precise, and tracking student progress is becoming more thorough and quantifiable.

--The department continues to align all courses to student learning outcomes, and all of our composition classes now include rubrics that articulate how our composition classes align with both ESU, national writing program, and KBOR outcomes.

--Two of our department members served on the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT), and our department continues to contribute robustly to General Education goals. As our new online MA in English program grows (we're up in enrollment about 30 percent over the past three years), we continue to develop and increase assessment related to that program.

AY2017

The department focused on a number of assessment initiatives this past year (Fall & Summer 2016-Fall 2017).

--The BA in English Assessment Committee ran a pilot assessment based on the BA (in English) Assessment Proposal. Student papers from two points in the program (one early in the BA and one late in the BA program) were evaluated (English 210 and 500-level English course papers) to track student learning progress and program strengths and weaknesses. A rubric was devised using our BA Curriculum Map as the guide, and each essay was evaluated by two regular faculty member readers. A full report on this assessment outcome, including rubrics and scoring, can be found in the attached file "BA_Assessment_Report_Spring2017"

--Composition I and II portfolio assessment continues, and is now in its fourth year. Both faculty and graduate teaching assistants collaborated in scoring student essays, using a rubric devised by our Composition Director and Composition Committee. A report on Composition Program Assessment is attached. See below under "Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps"--"Composition Program Assessment Report O'Meara 2016-2017 5-24-17"

--An initial Assessment Cycle for our BA, BSE, and MA Programs was devised in collaboration with Assistant Provost and Director of Assessment Dr. Jo Kord.

--Assessment for the Writing Center/English Learners Lab became more robust, detailed, and quantified under the center's new director, Joelle Spotswood. (See attached report located under Department Summaries, Strategies, and Next Steps: Reports: 2016 Academic Year.)

The department generated and updated curriculum maps for our programs (BA and BSE in English, BA and BSE in Modern Languages, and MA in English), completing all curriculum maps (August 2016). To further enhance the curricular structure of our academic programs, we continue to align all courses student learning outcomes with program specific curriculum maps, and these syllabi were stored in a single repository (Skybox). Two of our department members, Composition & Rhetoric Professors Dr. Kat O'Meara and Dr. Rachelle Smith, currently serve on the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT), and our department robustly contributes to assessing General Education goals. As our new online MA in English program grows, we continue to develop and increase assessment related to that new program.

AY2016

The department focused on generating and updating curriculum maps for our programs (BA and BSE in English, BA in Modern Languages, and MA in English). To further enhance the curricular structure of our academic programs, we aligned all course student learning outcomes with program specific curriculum maps. These syllabi were collected and stored in a single repository (Skybox) to serve as evidence for the academic infrastructure that exists in our department. Our department contributes to assessing General Education goals, and the overview of that assessment is included in the General Education program assessment plan.

AY2015

The department will be operating under an interim chair for the majority of the academic year. The SLAC charge is for each department to undergo an analysis of the curriculum for each representative program to insure currency and alignment of program and course learning outcomes. There were conversations about this topic and throughout the year progress made was minimal so opportunity exists to get this work done in the upcoming year. The major work done in assessment was with the English faculty being fully engaged in assessing the effectiveness of composition I and II courses. This assessment was a part of the overall general education assessment of goal 1 which is dedicated to core skill development. These assessments included both faculty and graduate teaching assistants collaborating in the scoring of student essays (Composition I) and portfolio's (Composition II) using a rubric developed by the Composition Committee. This is the second year of work using this format at the end of both the fall and spring terms.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

The department focused on a number of assessment initiatives this past year (Spring, Summer, and Fall 2018)

--The department developed a Five-Year Assessment Cycle, and the department has been assessing a number of upper-level (500-level) courses this year.

--Composition I and II portfolio assessment continues, and is now in its sixth year. Both faculty and graduate teaching assistants collaborate in scoring student essays, using a rubric devised by our Composition Director and Composition Committee. Composition II portfolios were assessed 7-9 May 2018. As a result of her work on First-Year Composition (FYC) Assessment, Prof. Kat O'Meara was a 2018 Assessment Champion.

--Year two of the BA portfolio assessment is currently ongoing (9 May 2018). Student papers from two points in the BA program (one early in the BA and one late in the BA program) were assessed. This was done to track student learning progress and program strengths and areas for improvement. This encompasses the work of two EMLJ committees, the BA Assessment Committee and the Reading Committee. The papers were evaluated using a portfolio system.

--Assessment for the Writing Center/English Language Learners Lab continued to be more robust, detailed, and quantified under the center's new director, Joelle Spotswood, now in her third year. Along with changes made to the Academic Center for Excellence and Success (ACES) reporting methods are becoming more precise, and tracking student progress is becoming more thorough and quantifiable.

--The department continues to align all courses to student learning outcomes, and all of our composition classes now include rubrics that articulate how our composition classes align with both ESU, national writing program, and KBOR outcomes.

--One of our department members (Prof. Kristy Dekat) served on the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT), and our department continues to contribute robustly to General Education goals. As our new online MA in English program grows (we're up in enrollment about 30 percent over the past four years), we continue to develop and increase assessment related to that program.

AY 2017

--In Modern Languages, we are in our second year of offering "enhanced" (hybrid) Spanish I and II sections. Students in these sections meet half of the time face-to-face, on campus, and part of the time online. This structure allows greater schedule flexibility for the students and was devised in part to meet the needs of students who are unable to meet MTWR(F) for beginning language classes. Students now may meet MWF or TR in person and the remaining days online. We are continuing initial assessment of these enhanced classes.

--Online MA in English enrollment is increasing. We now have about 15 students in that program, which began in the Fall of 2015. Also, our Graduate Certificate Program in English is gaining traction. We have about 3-5 students in that program, which began in Fall 2016. Assessment of these new and continuing graduate programs, which is essentially another part of our overall MA and graduate-level assessment, is underway.

--Our Reichardt Center for Publishing and the Literary Arts is generating a number of internships and assistantships, and we are developing ways to assess that new component in our curriculum.

--Two of our department members, Composition & Rhetoric Professors Dr. Kat O'Meara and Dr. Rachele Smith, continue to serve on the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT), and our department robustly contributes to assessing General Education goals. We look forward to applying into our curriculum what the GEAT team learns.

--Our department continues to participate in the direct measure course embedded assessment of General Education classes, such as English

207: Literary Perspectives. We continue to apply what we learn through that assessment process and look forward to analyzing the trends that develop over the coming years, as data amasses and begins to show more longitudinal patterns. I've attached the results of one course below.

AY 2016

As we were curriculum mapping for the MA in English Program, we discovered that we had opportunities to include additional online courses in the curriculum. This strategy was twofold. First, it allowed students to study our graduate-level English courses in an online setting, and, second, it allowed for enrollment growth in the program.

As we developed our curricular maps, we identified a core set of courses and established a graduate certificate program in English. This allows for current students or practicing professionals to gain expertise and expand on current knowledge in this content area.

AY 2015

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps (8-7-15)

As a new chair (starting 7 June 2015), I am still in the process of gathering our summary, strategies, and next steps. However, here are a few points of particular note.

--Assessment of the Online English Master's program is of high priority for the upcoming year as the program became available beginning fall 2015.

--Our Reichardt Center for Publishing and the Literary Arts, a center for publishing and literary citizenship opened Spring 2015, and is the locus for several publications in addition to creative writing program internships and field work. The publications include: FLINT HILLS REVIEW (national literary magazine), QUIVIRA (ESU student literary magazine), THE RECTANGLE (Sigma Tau Delta honors society national magazine). This new center will afford students the opportunity to hone their talents and gain valuable experience in internship and high impact practices. The direct assessment of students perspectives of these experiences will inform programming and internship opportunities going forward.

--With the new hire of Dr. Rachel Spaulding (Spanish/Ethnic Literature) we are renewing and revitalizing our goal to reach and link more completely with the Emporia Hispanic and Latino community, for recruitment and for event sharing. These community collaborations provide students with learning experiences that match up with our strategic plan goal 1: pursue distinctive initiatives in curricula and programs that will foster vibrant communities.

Assessments will continue in the Composition I and II courses as written communication skills are a high priority and other data points are showing that we have some opportunities to improve students' written communication skills. As a priority, we will progress forward on the curriculum mapping of program curricula and insuring alignment between program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes.

(See attached EMLJ Annual Report, 2014-2015).

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - EMLJ 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - EMLJ 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - EMLJ 2014](#)
- [Writing Center Yearly Report AY 2016-2017](#)
- [Sample of Course Embedded Assessment AY 2016 Rabas EG 280 Intro to Creative Writing](#)
- [Composition Program Assessment Report O'Meara 2016-2017 5-24-17](#)
- [EMLJ_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [Emlj-Senior-Survey-UG-FA2016-SP2017-SU2017-Grads](#)
- [AY 14-15 Assessment Report for Composition Program](#)
- [EMLJ Annual Report 2014-2015](#)
- [Fall 2014 Composition Program Assessment Report - Blankenship](#)
- [New Portfolio Rubric](#)
- [Senior Survey Results for EMLJ Grads for AY 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - EMLJ 2017](#)
- [16-17 Assessment Report \[O'Meara, 5.24.17\].pdf](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - EMLJ - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [All EMLJ Department Assessment Reports Combined-AY18.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - EMLJ 2018](#)

Program Name: English BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The department is beginning to evaluate results from our pilot assessment based on the BA (in English) Assessment proposal. Student papers from two points in the program (one early in the BA and one late in the BA program). This was done to track student learning progress and program strengths and weaknesses. The papers were evaluated using a portfolio system.

AY 2017

As I note, above, the BA in English Assessment Committee ran a pilot assessment based on the BA (in English) Assessment Proposal. Student papers from two points in the program (one early in the BA and one late in the BA program) were evaluated (English 210 and 500-level English course papers) to track student learning progress and program strengths and weaknesses. A rubric was devised using our BA Curriculum Map as the guide, and each essay was evaluated by two regular faculty member readers. A full report on this assessment outcome, including rubrics and scoring, can be found in the attached file "BA_Assessment_Report_Spring2017"

Assessment practices include measures of students grade performance in EG 201 - Introduction to Literary Study. This assessment is based on the programs first entry-level course. Final grades for the course were assessed point scores, and in 2011, 81% of BA-English majors received a passing score on the assessments of 3 or higher. In 2012, 90% of BA-English majors received a passing score. A Mid-Program Assessment for BA-English Majors included voluntary participation of portfolio submission where faculty evaluated works using a locally-developed rubric (aligned with program learning outcomes). Of those students participating 67% of students achieved a passing score (3 or higher on a 5-point scale). Thirty-three percent of students scored below 3. The direct measure of student learning showed that students who prepared the portfolio achieved a high level of mastery in all outcomes measured by this presentation assessment. The students who failed to achieve a passing score were those who did not submit a portfolio of work (having discarded their written works in earlier courses). The department intends to continue the assessment, and to consider adding it as a BA-English program requirement within the next 3-5 years. Students will be advised to keep copies of their papers from all courses, so that they will have adequate material to construct a portfolio for the Mid-Program Assessment. BA-English Majors also participate in a self-evaluation at the Mid Program point. All students self-reported growth in all five learning outcomes, with specific examples and analysis in written narrative form. Additionally, these self-evaluation narratives were reviewed by faculty as part of the portfolio assessment.

Attached Files

- [BA Assessment Report Spring 2017](#)
- [AA-LAS-EN-UAC0409 PASL 2013 English BA](#)
- [LAS-EN-ENGLISH-BSE](#)
- [Dekat-Kristine-JO200-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Behrens-Michael-EG207-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Dekat-Kristine-JO305-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Dekat-Kristine-JO501-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Martell-Liz-EG102-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Patton-Cynthia-EG310-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Patton-Cynthia-EG210-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Schmidtlein-Kristin-EG102-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Storm-Mel-EG575-FA17.pdf](#)

Program Name: English MA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

Online MA in English enrollment is booming; we have quadrupled online MA in English enrollment since its inception in 2015. In May, for our Spring semester, we graduated at least double (and nearly triple) the quota that KBOR requires for us for the entire year. Also, our Graduate Certificate Program in English continues to gain traction, and three students have completed the certificate. A number of online students are completing their degrees on a two-year schedule, like regular full-time students.

The SR Education Group, which monitors and rates online programs in all disciplines, has ranked us third nationally among English MA programs for "value" (factoring quality and cost) and sixth nationally for cost alone.

As enrollment increases, we are refining our processes to evaluate and assess online project papers and theses as well as calling upon faculty members to serve on those capstone committees. Instructor permissions are being given to the chair to "observe" online classes, a process that mirrors face-to-face observation, in part.

AY 2017

Online MA in English enrollment is booming (through the end of Spring 2017). We now have about 10 students in that program, which began in the Fall of 2015. Also, our Graduate Certificate Program in English is gaining traction. We have about 3-5 students in that program,

which began in Fall 2016. Assessment of these new and continuing graduate programs, which is essentially another part of our overall MA and graduate-level assessment, is underway.

As of Fall 2015, we are moving our MA English program into an “online option,” which allows students to complete our program in 2-3 years completely online. So, we will be aligning assessments with this program change accordingly to insure that program quality is congruent with the former face-to-face learning experience. The attached file shows assessments from the most recent reporting cycle.

Attached Files

[AA-LAS-EN-UAC0474 PASL 2010 English MA](#)

[LAS-EN-ENGLISH-MA](#)

[Behrens-Michael-EG530-FA17.pdf](#)

[O'Meara-Katherine-EG895-FA17.pdf](#)

[Storm-Mel-EG575-FA17.pdf](#)

[Behrens-Michael-EG730-FA17.pdf](#)

[Storm-Mel-EG770-FA17.pdf](#)

[Rabas-Kevin-EG587-FA17.pdf](#)

Program Name: Journalism BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

Cited from Section V of the KSDE Report Submitted in Fall 2017

The most current assessment data has been analyzed in the preparation of this report and will be used to enhance candidate performance and to strengthen the program. The assessment instruments (i.e. JO 490 Lesson Plan Project and JO 501 Law and Ethics of Journalism Essay) are provided to assess a candidate's understanding of practical and ethical issues involved in the teaching of journalism at the secondary level. The two assessments alone address six of the seven journalism standards (JO 50 I: Standards I &3 and JO 490: Standards 3-7). The low number of candidates and program completers makes it difficult for the journalism faculty to analyze results specific to those students. To help increase the number of candidates in the program, the BSE Journalism courses are now offered both online and on campus.

Course outcomes are regularly updated to align with current journalism standards. Courses are also regularly evaluated to determine if the course provides current technological skills essential for a journalism educator. For example, JO 305 Publication Design projects teaches candidates how to use InDesign for designing newspaper and yearbook pages, and Photoshop for photo editing and creating graphics. JO 490 Teaching Journalism in the Middle-Level and Secondary School course has been updated so that it not only aligns with the journalism teaching standards but also addresses the skill sets that are assessed in the Career and Technical Education AV Communication Pathway.

To verify the curriculum is meeting the needs of the current journalism classroom, faculty frequently travel to conferences. For instance, the faculty attended the fall Kansas Scholastic Press Association Conference and the fall National Scholastic Press Association and Journalism Education Association National High School Conference. The faculty also hosts the regional Kansas Scholastic Press Association high school journalism contest every February, and this also offers an opportunity to gather information from current journalism educators.

No areas for improvement were cited in the last KSDE program review. However, with the ever changing world of journalism and journalism education, every effort is being made by the faculty to keep themselves and the curriculum up-to-date.

Each semester the journalism faculty reviews the curriculum and compares departmental offerings to other journalism programs around the country to ensure thoroughness and relevance.

AY2017

The most current assessment date for the BSE-Journalism degree is currently being analyzed and prepared. The report is due this August. Prof. Kristy Dekat, our new journalism professor, has been very diligent and of great use in this process. A former Topeka high school journalism teacher, she is ideal as a preparer of this type of report. The 2017 KSDE Journalism Report is located along with supporting files in the file library. The KSDE report provides the overall analysis of the success of program completers and section V of the report is dedicated to use of assessment findings to improve the student learning experience and success.

AY2016

The most current assessment data has been analyzed in the preparation of this report and will be used to enhance candidate performance and to strengthen the program. Also, new assessments have been introduced in the preparation of this report. These provide instruments (i.e., the JO 490 Final Project Lesson and Unit Plans, and the JO 501 Critical Paper) to assess a candidate's understanding of practical and ethical

issues involved in the teaching of journalism at the secondary level. The low number of candidates and program completers makes it difficult for the journalism faculty to analyze results specific to those students. No areas for improvement were cited in the last KSDE program review. However, with the ever changing world of Journalism and Journalism Education, every effort is being made by the faculty to keep themselves and the curriculum up-to-date. When needed, new courses are offered on an experimental basis to help broaden the background of all journalism students. These have included Video Editing, Sports Reporting, Opinion Writing, and Social Media, and Media Convergence in the past two academic years. Faculty also frequently travel to conferences to keep current with journalism and journalism education trends. Examples from the past year include attendance and presentations at the following professional groups: Kansas Scholastic Press Association (2010-13), Kansas Associated Collegiate Press (2010-12); and the College Media Association conferences in New York and New Orleans (2013). The faculty also hosts the regional high school journalism contest every February, sponsored by the Kansas Scholastic Press Association, which affords an opportunity to work with hundreds of journalism students and dozens of advisers from area schools. In addition, one faculty member was named a Distinguished Publications Adviser for College Newspapers (2013) by the College Media Association. Each semester the journalism faculty reviews the curriculum and compares departmental offerings to other journalism programs around the country to ensure thoroughness and relevance. The most recent changes to the curriculum took place in 2011, when some courses were renumbered and new ones were added, including JO 507 Investigative Reporting and JO 506 Magazine Journalism, which may be taken as electives by BSE candidates.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 1 Data Tables 2016](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table 2016](#)
- [Assessment 2 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table 2016](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2016](#)
- [Assessment 4 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2016](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 2016](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table 2016](#)
- [Assessment 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [2016 KSDE Journalism Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables 2013](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table 2013](#)
- [Assessment 2 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table 2013](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2013](#)
- [Assessment 4 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2013](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 2013](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table 2013](#)
- [Assessment 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [JournalismKSDERpt2013](#)
- [LAS-EN-JOURNALISM-BSE](#)
- [Assessment 5 Syllabus for Publication Design- Fall 2016](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Journalism](#)
- [Assessment 6 JO 403 History and Principles of American Journalism Essay Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table Journalism](#)
- [Assessment 7- JO 501 Law and Ethics of Journalism Essay Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table Journalism](#)
- [Assessment 8- JO 490 Teaching Journalism in the Middle-Level and Secondary School- Lesson Plan Project Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables--Journalism](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table -Journalism](#)
- [Assessment 2 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Tables--Journalism](#)

- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table -Journalism](#)
- [Assessment 4 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2017 Revised](#)
- [2017 KSDE Journalism Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables--Journalism.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table -Journalism.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Tables--Journalism.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table -Journalism.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Journalism.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Syllabus for Publication Design- Fall 2016.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 6 JO 403 History and Principles of American Journalism Essay Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2017 Revised.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table Journalism.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7- JO 501 Law and Ethics of Journalism Essay Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table Journalism.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Lesson Plan Rubric.doc](#)
- [BSE Journalism Program of Study.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Journalism Report.docx](#)
- [Dekat-Kristine-JO200-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Dekat-Kristine-JO501-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Dekat-Kristine-JO305-FA17.pdf](#)
- [McCoy-Kimberley-JO200-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name: Middle Level English (5-8) BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

As in years past, the most current assessment data for the BSE-English degree is currently being analyzed and prepared. The report is due this August. Prof. Kevin Kienholz, a former high school English Teacher and EdD prepares this report. For KSDE middle level (5-8) ELA report, there was no data to report this cycle because no students graduated through our program during this year as middle level specialist learners. Because the KSDE visit is next year, a new report will be compiled and generated in the coming months, although for us this report will not be populated with data, since we have no middle level (5-8) students this cycle.

AY2017

The most current assessment data for the BSE-English degree is currently being analyzed and prepared. The report is due this August. Prof. Kevin Kienholz, a former high school English Teacher and EdD prepares this report. For KSDE middle level (5-8) ELA report, there was no data to report this cycle because no students graduated through our program during this year as middle level specialist learners. Because the KSDE visit is next year, a new report will be compiled and generated in the coming months, although for us this report will not be populated with data, since we have no middle level (5-8) students this cycle.

AY2016

As in previous years, the assessment data gathered for this report with respect to Standard 2 has become a part of a conversation in the English Department regarding the curriculum as it relates specifically to the requirements for American, British, and world literature courses. Starting in the fall of 2008, the English Department initiated a reevaluation of its curriculum for both the B.A. and the B.S.E. program, and the need to revisit the question regarding literature survey courses is evident. This is an ongoing conversation, especially given the fact that the candidates are not currently required to take survey courses in these three areas. The Department of English, Modern Languages, and Journalism continued the curricular review process in the fall of 2010, and the first proposal considered was the possibility of requiring some/all of the literature survey courses. The department has established a standing committee whose work will immediately take up the possibility of requiring some or all of the literature survey courses. The work of this committee continued to be informed by conversations held with B.S.E. students about their performances on the Praxis II exams, with specific attention given to the sub-section of the assessment that deals with literary texts. The input from the students indicate that their performance (specifically) and the program (in general) could potentially be enhanced if students took more survey coursework in American and British literatures. For the middle-level candidates, this issue might also be addressed through avenues other than required courses, since the middle-school program

does not require courses in American, British, or world literatures specifically. One such means of addressing this issue would be more intentional advising that would focus on using the English electives in the program to take survey courses rather than special topics classes as is currently allowed, and this approach has been discussed in departmental meetings. However, the program requirements for the MLE candidates will certainly be a topic of discussion, as the program does have some English electives that could be changed into literary survey requirements.

Although it is not necessarily the case for the middle-level candidates specifically, the data related to the program overall (including the secondary candidates) and with respect to Standard 1 also suggests that the program may need to place a greater emphasis on both pedagogical research methods as well as assessment. As a result of this latest data set, the timing of the introduction of those topics within the language arts methods class has been changed to provide more time to emphasize each of those components of the program. It is believed that this change in timing will allow the candidates to better understand and execute both the research they will be required to do to stay current with language arts pedagogy as well as to better understand the role of assessment in the English classroom. This assessment report was also one factor involved in the decision of the Department of English, Modern Languages, and Journalism to initiate a department-wide study to assess the research skills of all English majors in an effort to better address this aspect of our students' development as students of English. The pilot study began in the fall of 2009, and the department is currently discussing the information gathered from small focus groups discussions with students in addition to data gathered from an assessment on research methodology. The decision was made to place an emphasis on research methodology in every English course in an effort to address what the data suggests (along with student interviews) is an area that needs improvement in our program. This effort is on-going, and a follow-up study is being planned to assess how these efforts are working.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 6 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [KSDE Report ELA Middle ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric KPTP Tasks 1 and 2 ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric KPTP Tasks 3 and 4 ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric](#)
- [ML English Report Fall 2013](#)
- [LAS-EN-ENGLISH-BSE](#)

- [Assessment 4 Rubric KPTP Tasks 3 and 4 ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric KPTP Tasks 1 and 2 ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table ELA Middle Level](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric ELA Middle Level](#)
- [KSDE Report ELA Middle Level-Revised](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric KPTP Tasks 1 and 2 ELA Middle Level.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric KPTP Tasks 3 and 4 ELA Middle Level.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Report ELA Middle ELA Middle Level.docx](#)
- [Patton-Cynthia-EG210-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Storm-Mel-EG575-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Patton-Cynthia-EG310-FA17.pdf](#)

Program Name: Modern Languages and Literature BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

Cited from Section V of the KSDE Report for Fall 2017

The assessment data with respect to Standards 1 and 2 is a conversation topic in the Department of English, Modern Languages and Journalism because students need to demonstrate excellence in the foreign language in order to pass the Praxis Content Test. There is a Curriculum Review Committee in the Department that evaluates and reviews the courses offered in the BA and BSE in Modern Languages every semester to see if requirement courses are challenging enough so that BSE majors can pass the Praxis Content Test II for the state successfully.

Candidates in the foreign language program are doing well according to foreign language standards and assessments being used. If we want to improve this program, we need to better prepare students in content knowledge so that non-native speakers of the foreign language can be more successful on state exams. Making study abroad a requirement in the BSE program will help raise content knowledge. However, only one summer abroad is not enough to be prepared for the Praxis Content II. Students need to stay at least one full semester at an institution abroad so that they can internalize all aspects of the foreign language and culture to be transferred to their own students. I can say that

students who have stayed one semester abroad have been more prepared to pass the Praxis Content II Test. In fact, this year candidate stayed in Mexico for a semester and she has already passed the Praxis Content II test successfully. More than 75% of the teacher candidates in Modern Languages pass the state exams, Praxis Content II and Praxis PLT in the last three years.

AY2017

The most current assessment date for the BSE-Modern Languages: Spanish degree is currently being analyzed and prepared. The report is due this August. Prof. Luisa Perez, PhD in Teaching Methods, prepares this report. The KSDE report and supporting files are uploaded to the file library. The assessment findings and strategies to improve student learning and success are reported in section V of the 2017 Foreign Language Grades PreK-12 KSDE report as evidenced in the file library.

AY2016

Foreign Language Methods Test

This assessment has been created to assess pedagogical knowledge skills during the Methods class (FL540) in the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures. It has been designed to assess methods, approaches, strategies, techniques, lesson planning, test construction, national and Kansas standards, The test consists of eight essay sections (3 hours) on a 1-40 points scale, each section has a five point value. In other words, 40 points equals 100 percent. Program completer's take this test at the end of FL540.

Assessment Goals

Relevant Indicators of the Conceptual Framework: are command of content, critical ideas and skills, capacity to reflect on, diversity understanding, professionalism, collaboration, leadership, technology knowledge, integration of knowledge, theory and practice, and how to foster student learning. The candidate who is competent in these proficiencies becomes The Professional.

This assessment consists of the following sections:

- Essential concepts of foreign language pedagogy
- History of foreign language education in the United States
- Current foreign language methods and trends: cooperative learning, multiple intelligences, graphic organizers, immersion workshop, dialogue journals, curriculum integration, storytelling, art, music, films, and dramatic projects
- Similarities and differences between first and second language acquisition
- Planning, assessment and instruction concepts applicable to different levels, various developmental needs and interests, respect for cultural differences, and respond to challenges from children's behavioral problems
- Apply a variety of instructional techniques and materials to promote diverse student learning, critical thinking, and problem solving
- Identify criteria and resources for selecting quality methodology for use in the elementary and secondary school
- Identify elements of appropriate visual aids and technology on foreign language teaching,

Alignment with standards

Standard 6

The teacher of a foreign language motivates both individuals and groups to create a target language learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.

Section 5 of this assessment is specifically related to this standard provided that completers have to create lesson plans (planning instruction) that include a target language learning environment by planning active conversation in groups, chats, role-plays, drama, songs, films, whole participation and self-motivation.

Standard 7

The teacher of a foreign language models a variety of effective communication and instructional techniques to address the diverse needs of students.

Section 3 of this assessment specifically refers to teaching modes and instructional techniques knowledge to create lesson plans, performance, and assessment addressing diverse needs and diverse intelligences by developing students' higher order thinking skills.

By obtaining a mean of 98% on this test during three consecutive years, we can say that our program completers have met standards 6 and 7.

Data Summary

One hundred percent of program completers have passed this assessment successfully during three consecutive years (2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013) with a mean score of 98% , a passing score of 90% and a range of 97-99; accordingly, they have demonstrated to have knowledge of methods and trends, strategies, and techniques to achieve students' learning along with appropriate assessments that address diverse needs. They have also demonstrated that they know how to use a variety of teaching and assessment activities to accommodate different learning modes, such as group activities, audio presentations, speaking and conversational opportunities, written expressions, physical activities, etc.

Major findings have been that the switch on the type of content test for assessment 6 has been an advantage for program completers given that most candidates pass the Praxis Test now. The Praxis Practice Test is much more challenging than the one we had in place before.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 1b](#)
- [Assessment 2 data](#)
- [Assessment 3](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data for standard 5, TWS factor 5](#)
- [Assessment%207%20Data%20Table2](#)
- [Assessment5%205\[1\]](#)
- [Assessment6%205\[1\]](#)
- [Assessments 2 and 4--KPTP Template \(1\)](#)
- [Assessments 2 and 4--KPTP Template](#)
- [ForeignLanguage Template2015 _NewStandards](#)
- [Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Writing to Assessment #3 \(Clinical Observation Tool\)](#)
- [Assessment 1b PLT Data](#)
- [Assessment 2 data](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data for standard 5, TWS factor 5](#)
- [Assessment 3](#)
- [Assessment 3 rubric Field-Based](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data for standard 5, TWS factor 5](#)
- [Assessment%201%20Data%20Table\[1\]](#)
- [Assessment%205\[1\]](#)
- [Assessment%207%20Data%20Table\[2\]](#)
- [Assessment%207\[1\]](#)
- [Assessment6%205\[1\]](#)
- [ForeignLanguageTemplate20133](#)
- [PASL Report Frame for BSE](#)
- [LAS-EN-SPANISH-BSE](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table-Foreign Language](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 5-Rubric-Foreign Language](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table-Foreign Language](#)
- [KSDE 2017 Foreign Language Grades PreK-12](#)
- [Praxis Content Test Practice](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables-Foreign Language](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table-Foreign Language](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Tables--Foreign Language](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables-Foreign Language.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table-Foreign Language.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)

- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table-Foreign Language.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5-Rubric-Foreign Language.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Praxis Content Test Practice.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table2.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Report Foreign Language.docx](#)
- [Foreign Language-ProgramofStudy.pdf](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-FL540-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-SA110-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-SA110-SU17.pdf](#)
- [Robinson-Gregory-SA210-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA339-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA313-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA379-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA466-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name: Modern Languages and Literature BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

Modern Languages (ML) has made a great many changes this past year. As part of a three-year, phase-in project, ML have started using graduate students and instructors to teach beginning-level Spanish and French classes. In the future, (starting in Fall 2018), "program assistants" will be used to teach these beginning level courses, and the program assistants will teach the in-person part of the class, and regular faculty will monitor the online component. This frees up our faculty to teach more courses, both at the intermediate and advanced level, working to recruit and graduate more Spanish majors.

Our three regular faculty as well as department chair have access to all online courses, so that observation can be accomplished.

A close eye is being kept on ML enrollment and trends, as we continue to grow enrollment and our overall ML program.

Two ML long-serving instructors retired at the end of the Fall 2018 semester, and they were replaced with program assistants, thus saving money and assisting in the implementing newer, more current ML pedagogical practices, including using our hybrid, enhanced-class interface. Using this pedagogical and technological approach, all in-class time is spent in the target language (such as Spanish), and most grammatical and technical work is done online. All exams and quizzes are pre-designed, and scored by technology, thus freeing up program assistants and regular faculty to spend more quality time working on and in the target language, so students gain practical and essential, "real world" spoken-language proficiency.

As last year, indirect assessments (Senior Exit Survey) showed that overall, students are satisfied with their experience in the Modern Languages programs. The area for improvement opportunities was related to advising, specifically related to career and graduate school opportunities. Advisors will take measures to improve in this area of their advising roles.

AY2017

To further enhance the curricular structure of our academic programs, we continue to align all courses student learning outcomes with program specific curriculum maps, and these syllabi were stored in a single repository (Skybox). Pre- and Post-Tests are used to assess student learning gains in 1st, 2nd, and 3rd semester language courses.

As last year, indirect assessments (Senior Exit Survey) showed that overall, students are very satisfied with their experience in the Modern Languages programs. The area for improvement opportunities was related to advising, specifically related to career and graduate school opportunities. Advisors will take measures to improve in this area of their advising roles.

AY2016

Pre and Post Tests are used to assess student learning gains in 1st, 2nd, and 3rd semester language courses. Overall, there is less progress in the second year (intermediate level) as students reach a plateau that is difficult to surmount as research and anecdotic evidence have amply demonstrated. One way of remedying this barrier is to study abroad. Being immersed in a language and the culture is beneficial to the foreign language learner. Our modern language faculty encourage students to go abroad and study their target language in a native speaker environment. The capstone portfolio consists of a reflective essay, compositions, a real-life essay, and supplementary works. A mean score is derived from each of the works and totalled for a mean sum score. We have not assessed the portfolio for multiple semesters yet, so summative assessment scores have not been used to inform change. In the future, these scores will lead to improvement opportunities. As with the capstone portfolio, the capstone presentation is assessed by two components, the abstract and the oral presentation where mean scores are summed to derive a total score mean. These scores are used for summative assessments across multiple terms, but likewise the opportunity to use the data has yet to materialize. It is preferred that an assessment of the study abroad experience can be incorporated into program assessment practices. This will involve a collaboration with the Office of International Education as well as foreign language faculty. Indirect assessments (Senior Exit Survey) showed that overall, students are very satisfied with their experience in the Modern Languages programs. The area for improvement opportunities was related to advising, specifically related to career and graduate school opportunities. Advisors will take measures to improve in this area of their advising roles.

Attached Files

- [LAS-EN-MODERN LANGUAGES-BA](#)
- [AA-LAS-EN-UAC0421 PASL 2013 Modern Languages and Literatures BA](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-SA110-SU17.pdf](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-SA110-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA339-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Robinson-Gregory-SA210-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA313-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA379-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA466-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name: Secondary Level English (6-12) BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:**AY2018**

The most current assessment date for the BSE-English degree is currently being analyzed and prepared. The report is due this August. Prof. Kevin Kienholz, a former high school English Teacher and EdD prepares this report. The Fall 2017 report and supporting evidence files are uploaded in the file library directly below.

AY2017

The most current assessment date for the BSE-English degree is currently being analyzed and prepared. The report is due this August. Prof. Kevin Kienholz, a former high school English Teacher and EdD prepares this report. The Fall 2016 report and supporting evidence files are uploaded in the file library directly below.

AY2016

The Kansas Department of Education sets learning standards (outcomes) for all programs that prepare teachers for a career as a professional educator. These assessment cycles and affiliated reports drive the curriculum and in required coursework. It is through these requirements that assessment programs are designed and cycle based on these KSDE requirements as well. The changes made as a result of these assessments are as follows:

As in previous years, the assessment data with respect to Standard 1 gathered for this report has become a part of a conversation in the Department of English, Modern Languages, and Journalism regarding the curriculum as it relates specifically to the requirements for American, British, and world literature courses. Starting in the fall of 2008, the English Department initiated a reevaluation of its curriculum for both the B.A. and the B.S.E. program, and the need to revisit the question regarding literature survey courses is evident. A new curriculum review committee has been recently formed (in the spring 2014), so this is an ongoing process, especially given the fact that students are not currently required to take survey courses in these three areas. Thus, the Department of English, Modern Languages, and Journalism continues the curricular review process, and at the department is considering a curricular change requiring survey courses in American, British, and/or world literature. The work of this committee will also be informed by conversations held with B.S.E. students about their performance on the Praxis II exams. Of course, the possibility of new state standards for the ELA program is also an important part of this conversation. The input from the students indicate that their performance (specifically) and the program (in general) could

potentially be enhanced if students took more survey coursework in American and British literature. Currently, students must take a literature course in each of the areas, but it may prove more beneficial to the candidates if they are required to take broad survey courses. It should also be noted that if the department decides to move in the direction of requiring some/all of the literature survey courses, this may open up the possibility of a new set of assessments related to this standard, as all students would be eligible to take a common assessment relative to their command of various literatures.

The program noted that the weakest performance on the Praxis II came on the second subsection of the assessment. Although the mean score for nearly every candidate was acceptable and above the target goal of 70% of points earned, a lower percentage of students scored at target than on the other relevant elements of the assessment. As a result, the department held discussions about the possibility of increasing the frequency of offerings for the English course that most directly deals with the content of the history of the English language. As a result of these discussions, the program began offering EG 575 (History of the English Language) during both the fall and spring semesters of the 2010-2011 academic year so that the candidates will have greater opportunity to take this class and have more options to take it later in their program and, as a result, closer to the time when they will take the Praxis II assessment. The department will continue to monitor this assessment to see if the program change results in improved candidate performance on this element of the assessment program.

In the past, the data with respect to Standard 4 also suggests that the program needed to place a greater emphasis on both pedagogical research methods as well as assessment. As a result of this latest data set, the timing of the introduction of those topics within the language arts methods class has been changed to provide more time to emphasize each of those components of the program. It is believed that this change has resulted in the candidates better understanding and executing both the research they will be required to do to stay current with language arts pedagogy as well as to better understand the role of assessment in the English classroom. In the fall of 2012, the decision was made to begin building a stronger English education collection in the university library, with a number of books being requested to add to holdings in the William A. White Library. Moreover, the English Department has also initiated a department-wide study to examine the research skills of all English majors in an effort to better address this aspect of our students' development. The pilot study began in the fall of 2009, and the department is currently discussing the information gathered from small "focus group" discussions with students and from an examination on research methodology. The decision was made to place an emphasis on research methodology in every English course in an effort to address what the data suggests (along with student interviews) is an area that needs improvement in our program. This effort is ongoing, and a follow-up study is being planned to assess how these efforts are working.

Attached Files

- [KSDE Report for English Language Arts Fall 2016](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric Summer 2017](#)
- [KSDE Report for English Language Arts Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric Summer 2017](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table Summer 2017](#)
- [LAS-EN-ENGLISH-BSE](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table Fall 2014](#)

- [Assessment 3 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric Fall 2014](#)
- [KSDE Program Report English Language Arts 6-12 for Fall 2013](#)
- [ML English Report Fall 2014](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables Praxis-PLT.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table KPTP-TWS.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table Student Teaching Assessment.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table KPTP-TWS.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric EL Final Exam.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Course Grades.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Short Story LP Presentation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table Unit Plan Design.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table Literary Analysis Project.docx](#)
- [English BSE Program Requirements \(Post 2009\).docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Report for English Language Arts.docx](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

It is apparent that you are continuing to add moving parts to your assessment practices across all of the major degree programs. Those programs that report assessment activities as a part of the KSDE requirements are going to be on bi-annual reporting cycles. In those years, when only student outcomes data are being collected, it is appropriate to provide a summary of the assessment work being done, then in KSDE reporting years, the uploading of the report and supporting evidence documents is appropriate (BSE Programs: Journalism, Middle Level English (5-8), Modern Languages, and Literature, Secondary Level English (6-12). It will be important to schedule cyclical assessments for those courses that are part of both BA and BSE programs, but are not assessed as a part of the BSE programs. The teaching methods courses are always assessed as a part of the BSE programs, it may be beneficial to assess the individual courses that make up the English BA curriculum. I have added in the English BA 5-Year Assessment Cycle Plan template, for some reason it was not there or had been deleted. You will want to track and assess your individual courses in years 2, 3, and 4. The portfolio analysis being done is the perfect

assessment tool for the ongoing capstone assessment in all years 1-4. The department had good faculty participation in the individual course level student learning outcomes assessment reporting. I have uploaded both the department summary and the individual assessment reports in the files for the specific major programs. In reading through the reports, there were some thorough assessments reported including some during term and subsequent term student learning improvement strategies. These change strategies will serve the programs well as adapting to student learning is an ongoing process that challenges all professional educators.

If over time the portfolio assessment becomes unwieldy, you may want to consider using a different approach. An option is to identify a marquee assignment or common assignments across a sequence of courses and score the student works to a common rubric as a function of the grading process. This practice can yield quality information and the strength of the method is in the numbers of student works assessed. Patterns of strengths and learning barriers will emerge in a short amount of time. This assessment practice can be a comparable substitute for portfolio analysis. This is just an idea, but if the general consensus is that portfolio analysis just isn't practical using an alternative assessment process may have better sustainability. The work in deciding the common assignments and the common rubric is upfront, but once this is done then the assessment application occurs on behalf of each faculty member in their respective course.

For the English MA program the individual course assessments were completed. I thought that you all were already using a common rubric to score the master projects or capstone courses? I didn't see any evidence documents uploaded supporting this practice or maybe I just am unaware of the timing for when you are starting these assessments to the rubric? For the online MA program you have all the pieces in place to use the Canvas platform to set up your assessments. You have a curriculum map, student learning outcomes in courses, and assignments all can be aligned with rubrics (that the faculty design) in the Canvas interface and the assessment piece for the online program can be self-contained. Anna Catterson may be a good resource to assist in setting up this process. You can also use the excel file that lists the student success metrics to show the alignment between English MA students success in the face-to-face program versus the online program. If you need assistance in my showing you how to do this, please reach out to me.

The assessment practices employed for the General Education courses supported by the department continues to be a strength. The composition program a few years back had the highest percentages of students who were unsuccessful across all general education courses. When you review the course level success metrics, there has been a marked improvement for student success metrics for Composition I and II courses. In addition, you have numerous faculty assessing the other general education courses in your department. Please encourage your faculty to assess their individual courses and to attend assessment workshops throughout the academic year. I appreciate all you do in making assessment practices a part of your overall teaching and learning strategies. Good Job!

Academic Year 2017

The assessment practices utilized by the English, Modern Languages, and Journalism department positively continue to evolve and engage more faculty in the processes. Nice job! In the past three years, the EMLJ faculty have continuously and effectively engaged in multiple types of highly effective assessment strategies (course-embedded, portfolio analyses, senior survey, general education courses and GEAT). In addition, this past year has been a very busy one for those faculty who are tasked with coordinating the assessments for the multiple English, Languages, and Journalism programs under the requirements of the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE). Inclusion of the usage metrics for the Writing Center, as the new director reports on the strengths and challenges of the center's operations is a welcomed report document when reporting and sharing assessment information. In 2017, the EMLJ faculty were proactive in transitioning the English BA and MA programs for incorporating the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans. This cyclical assessment strategy is new and extends some existing assessment structures. Any time we change there are those challenges that we encounter that are expected and others that present at different times during the change. And, it is always appreciated when the faculty are open to sharing thoughts and insights about the complexities of the curriculum structure, and it is evident that dividing up the courses in the 5-Year plan will require some experimentation when working to assess all of the courses offered. In our one-on-one conversations, it was apparent that it may take more than the initial five year cycle to cover the enormity and variability of courses in the curriculum. Similarly, with the topical content variability in a few select courses it may be deemed more effective to have a faculty focus group to assess the best approach to continuously approve these courses instead of using course embedded assessment strategies. Assessment is always an evolving process and faculty engagement is the key to navigating changes to improve student learning. I notice in the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans that you choose to assign faculty participation instead of individual courses for the 2nd-4th years of the course-embedded assessments. It is recommended that you work with faculty to determine one or two courses that are being taught by the assigned faculty member for course level assessments. I say this to keep the assessment practices manageable (faculty member doesn't have to assess and report every course being taught every term). The idea would be to assess different courses during years two through four, to determine if the course is meeting the needs of the role it serves in the overall curriculum, not necessarily to track the scores of different groups of students over time. If a group of faculty choose to use portfolio assessment to review the quality of student performance, this is great, as portfolio analysis can be a very valuable assessment practice informing both content knowledge and skill sets. In these instances, it is appropriate to select a single faculty member from the group scoring the portfolio's to enter the assessment results in the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment reporting tool.

The English BA portfolio assessment process and report attached as evidence is a nicely organized assessment strategy and should serve the department well. Be sure to report the changes that are made to improve student learning as an outcome of these assessment activities. A good strategy to pursue after the portfolio scoring has been completed is to bring all faculty together to engage in conversation about the findings, what can/should be done to improve student learning, and to identify and implement change strategies going forward.

It is worthy of noting the multiple contributions of the EMLJ faculty in the assessment of the general education courses and goals. Individual faculty participating in reporting the assessment of the Composition, English, and Journalism courses is greatly appreciated! The coordinated assessment practices for those Composition I and II courses using the portfolio analyses has been a continuous practice over multiple years and the positive affects on the student success metrics are evidence that this strategy is highly effective. The contributions of Dr's. Kat O'Meara and Rachelle Smith on the General Education Assessment Team (2017) were key in informing strategies going forward, not only to improve the general education core skills goal, but to identify additional opportunities for writing across the curriculum. Likewise, the extended efforts of the faculty who engage in coordinating and reporting the KSDE assessment reports and related documentation of student success metrics are to be commended. These reports require an extraordinary amount of expertise and time dedicated to ensuring the efficacy of the English, Languages, and Journalism teacher preparation programs. It is always a pleasure to work with the faculty of the EMLJ department in its assessment efforts, keep up the great work!

Academic Year 2016

The department has updated curriculum maps for all programs worked over the past year positioning the faculty to engage in assessment at the course levels to ensure that student learning outcomes are being met and that the curriculum remains current. The area for focus in the upcoming year should be in the English-MA program. This online program has opportunities to leverage the Canvas LMS using the assessment tools that are part of the platform. It would benefit the faculty instructing the English Masters program to align their courses student learning outcomes using the curriculum map and to design rubrics that match the outcomes across courses. Using this alignment can assist faculty in tracking student success related to all of the program level learning outcomes. This may be an area where a faculty group meeting with our IT professionals and myself could help implement the ability to measure students successful completion of program outcomes across their coursework. It would be a really neat way to implement the overall assessment plan for the program using the Canvas learning management toolkit. The BSE programs and affiliated assessments are dictated for the most part of the Kansas Department of Education. Reporting the outcomes of these assessments of standards legitimizes the BA programs as well as students are completing the same courses for both the BA and BSE programs with additional teaching methods courses affiliated with the BSE. Be sure to upload the data tables for the BSE programs in the evidence files as they become available, and also upload the overall KSDE reports. Section V of the KSDE reports provides narrative for improvements and strategies for student learning success. This narrative is fitting for use in the narrative sections of this plan template as well. The department has made some good progress on the curriculum mapping, next steps are to determine where to focus assessment efforts at the program and course levels within each program. For the non-BSE programs, a good place to start is to assess capstone or upper division courses to identify voids where students may not be learning up to expectations. This focus can then be traced to specific courses in the curriculum map with subsequent assessment efforts being prioritized for those courses that affect overall program level goals.

Academic Year 2015

The current assessment plan for the department is sound and has some form of ongoing assessment for each of the programs. Those teacher education programs (BSE degrees) have robust assessments in place as dictated by the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE standards and reporting structures). These KSDE reports and accompanying evidence files show progressively how assessment data on completers drives curricula change over time. It will be important to spend adequate time with faculty in designing the assessment plan for the online English-MA program. Although existing courses will be converted to online courses, the change in the learning environment will require that some intentional assessments be put in place to insure that the integrity of the program isn't compromised in the transition from face-to-face to online. The best opportunities for enhancing assessment efforts exists in those programs which are not a part of the KSDE oversight. The English BA and Modern Languages and Literatures BA programs have some assessments in place and the timing of the assessments is appropriate (First course in major curriculum; Mid-Level). It would be fitting to add in an assessment in the capstone course where it isn't yet occurring. Also, in reviewing previous assessment data (PASL) reports there wasn't an explanation for how the assessment findings were going to be informing the improvement in student learning. One of the first questions faculty ask is what type of assessment data do we need to improve the student learning experience, then these answers drive what is selected for assessment and at what levels during the course of the curriculum. Course embedded assessments (assignments, projects, reports, tests, and presentations) can all serve to inform change. Choose those experiences that you know will be part of the curriculum over time, this way you can look at the changes over time as you apply new pedagogical strategies or change the curriculum based on what you learn from student performance. As you choose what will be assessed, it is more productive to focus in on something that faculty see as an area which has opportunity for improvement. Measuring student works that are all done well, serves no purpose other than to support what we already know is positively occurring in the learning experience. Choose those things that are near and dear that faculty want to make a difference with. Assessment used in this fashion is a win-

win situation for the students and the faculty.

Providing Department: English, Modern Languages and Journalism

Responsible Roles:

Kevin Rabas (E10000565), Kevin Kienholz (E10087799), Luisa Perez (E10000081), Kristine Dekat (e11098203), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

English BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The English BA Assessment Committee ran a short pilot assessment of our English-BA curriculum in Spring 2017. This pilot included assessment of three courses. One is Introduction to Literary Study (EG 210), a course taken by all English-BA majors. The remaining two courses are interchangeable and were used as a capstone course indicator. The results are attached directly below ("EG 210 & 500-level reports": "BA_Assessment_Report_Spring_2017"). And the capstone-type courses are as follows: EG 530 ZA "British Drama after 1945" or EG 560 A "Early Modern Women's Writing".

Additionally, assessment is yearly and ongoing for all composition classes (such as Basic Writing and Composition I and II). Composition program assessment is initiated and evaluated using a portfolio system.

FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT REVIEW CYCLE:

Since courses are so very variable and changeable in our department, course assessment is divided by faculty member in this assessment system, and, each year, all of the courses taught by a certain faculty member will be evaluated in order to gather a representative sample.

Year One-Four (FY17-FY20): Composition Program, capstone, Gen. Ed. courses (survey)

Also evaluated:

EG 101: Composition I

EG 210: Introduction to Literary Study

EG 310: Literary Criticism

EG 370: Language and Grammars

EG 385: Poetry Writing

EG 530: Studies in British Literature

EG 575: History of the English Language

EG 587: Playwriting & Screenwriting

Summary 2018

Our capstone is essentially senior BA majors taking 500-level English courses. Thus, this is why in our portfolio assessment we prioritize essays by senior BA students from 500-level courses for assessment. (Data about this study is directly below, in the Year 2 reporting).

The BA Assessment Committee, assisted by the BA Reading Committee, ran a second portfolio assessment of our English BA curriculum in 2018, following the first (and pilot) portfolio assessment in 2017. The details are directly below.

Attached Files

[LAS-EN-ENGLISH-BA](#)

[BA_Assessment_Report_Spring_2017](#)

[Behrens-Michael-EG207-FA17.pdf](#)

[Rabas-Kevin-EG587-FA17.pdf](#)

[O'Meara-Katherine-EG101-FA17.pdf](#)

[Martell-Liz-EG102-SP18.pdf](#)

[Patton-Cynthia-EG310-FA17.pdf](#)

[Rabas-Kevin-EG385-FA17.pdf](#)

[Patton-Cynthia-EG210-FA17.pdf](#)

[Storm-Mel-EG370-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Summary 2018

Five-Year Assessment Plan, EMLJ

Year Two (FY18):

The English BA Assessment Committee, assisted by the BA Assessment Reading Committee, ran a portfolio assessment of our English-BA curriculum in Spring 2018, including a survey of 4 courses: the fall 2017 semester sections of EG 210, EG 515, EG 530, and EG 575. These four courses were assessed by a total of three regular faculty members in our department, using a portfolio assessment system.

Each 500-level essay was written by a senior English BA major. Each 210 essay was written by an English BA major. Each essay was read by two readers (Emporia State University faculty members). Each reader was given a folder with a short instruction sheet, an assessment rubric, eight anonymous essays, and essay assignment sheets from the appropriate courses.

The BA Assessment Committee developed an updated rubric in the spring 2018 semester. The rubric was based directly on the department learning outcomes. The three questions asked on the rubric are following:

Student responds appropriately to the assignment.

Student demonstrates close reading and/or appropriate textual analysis skills.

Student has an understanding of the techniques of scholarly writing.

The following numerical ratings were applied to each of the three questions for each essay: 4=Excelling, 3=Accomplishing, 2=Progressing, 1=Developing, 0=No evidence of skill, and NA=Not applicable

The results are as follows:

Total Averages for EG 210	
Student responds appropriately to the assignment.	2.64
Student demonstrates close reading and/or appropriate textual analysis skills.	2.5
Student has an understanding of the techniques of scholarly writing.	2.21
Total Averages for 500-level BA Courses	
Student responds appropriately to the assignment.	2.9
Student demonstrates close reading and/or appropriate textual analysis skills.	2.3
Student has an understanding of the techniques of scholarly writing.	2.2

These numbers will be analyzed further in a future report that will be presented to the Fall 2018 BA Assessment Committee, the EMLJ Department Chair, and possibly the entire EMLJ Department.

Additionally, assessment is yearly and ongoing for all composition classes (such as Basic Writing and Composition I and II). Composition program assessment is initiated and evaluated using a portfolio system. Also evaluated:

EG 210: Introduction to Literary Study (Fall 2017 section; part of the BA Portfolio Assessment)

EG 515: Rhetoric of the Uncanny (Fall 2017 section; part of the BA Portfolio Assessment)

EG 530: Social Reform and Victorian Literature (Fall 2017 section; part of the BA Portfolio Assessment)

EG 575: History of the English Language (Fall 2017 section; part of the BA Portfolio Assessment)

For both EG 210 and the three 500-level BA classes, question 1 is an expression of EMLJ SLO 1 (Students will demonstrate mastery of knowledge of content relevant to the discipline.) Question 2 is an expression of EMLJ SLO 2 (Students will demonstrate mastery of critical methodology relevant to the discipline). Question 3 is an expression of EMLJ SLO 4 (Students will demonstrate mastery of the techniques of scholarly and/or creative writing).

As can be seen from the above data, the scores range from 2.2-2.9; thus, for all three SLOs evaluated in this portfolio assessment for these four courses, the data primarily suggests "met," with some "exceeds." (We do not have any "does not meet" students, during this current portfolio study).

Next steps include an effort to move more students from "met" to "exceeds," using the data below as a template and baseline. Renewed emphasis on the "understanding of the techniques of scholarly writing," which scored 2.2, will be an item for discussion in an EMLJ department meeting. This emphasis can be embedded in class instruction and daily class goals, where appropriate.

Attached Files

[Copy of Assessment 2018 graphs 2.1.xlsx](#)

[initial raw data SLO 1 2 4 6-20-18 EMLJ 1.1.csv](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year Three (FY19):

Also evaluated:

EG 241: Later American Literature

(More additions to list, pending)

Summary 2019

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year Four (FY20): (pending)

Summary 2020

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Summary and reflection.

Providing Department: English BA

Responsible Roles: Kevin Rabas (E10000565)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

English MA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

An overview and examination of assessment practices commenced. A discussion of the differences between 500-level and 700-level English MA courses was held.

Summary 2018

A dialogue on how to structure and evaluate online MA courses was held. (Are there differences between online and in-person MA classes in EMLJ?) A discussion on how to handle the coming influx of MA theses and project papers was held. (How will we handle these? Who will serve on the committees? What technology will be needed--Zoom, Skype, call-ins?) A discussion on how to "observe" online classes was held, and Dept. Chair Kevin Rabas was "added" to a number of online class rosters, for observational purposes.

Attached Files

[LAS-EN-ENGLISH-MA](#)

[Storm-Mel-EG575-FA17.pdf](#)

- [Rabas-Kevin-EG587-FA17.pdf](#)
- [O'Meara-Katherine-EG895-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Behrens-Michael-EG530-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Behrens-Michael-EG730-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Storm-Mel-EG770-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

EG 730: Studies in British Literature

EG 890: Master's Seminar in English

Summary 2018

As online MA and graduate certificate enrollment increases (we have quadrupled online graduate enrollment since 2015), we are searching for improved ways to assess online classes as well as ways to handle the work load, when it comes to the oncoming theses and project papers this new population will produce. (Committee members will be needed.) Online classes are included in our Master's level assessment, and a portfolio system is being used, led by Assessment Committee Chair Prof. Michael Behrens. Prof. Mel Storm, English Graduate Director, is part of the portfolio committee, and is evaluating papers from across our graduate-level classes, as part of this committee.

Additionally, MA in English 5-year assessment also somewhat mirrors BA in English assessment, since 500-level classes can be taken by both MA and upper-level BA students, so there is data overlap, when it comes to these two entities.

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary 2019

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary 2020

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: English MA

Responsible Roles: Kevin Rabas (E10000565)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Modern Languages and Literature BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Since courses are so very variable and changeable in our department, course assessment is divided by faculty member in this assessment system, and, each year, all of the courses taught by a certain faculty member will be evaluated in order to gather a representative sample.

BA in Spanish

Year One-Four (FY17-FY20): Gen. Ed. courses (survey), capstone courses (FL489)

Year Two (FY18): Rachel Spaulding

Year Three (FY19): Greg Robinson

Year Four (FY20): Luisa Perez

Year Five (FY21): Executive Summary

Summary 2018

Attached Files

- [LAS-EN-MODERN LANGUAGES-BA](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-FL540-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-SA110-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Schmidtlein-Kristin-EG102-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Robinson-Gregory-SA210-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Spaulding-Rachel-SA313-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Perez-Luisa-SA110-SU17.pdf](#)

[Robinson-Gregory-GR110-FA17.pdf](#)

[Robinson-Gregory-AB300-SP18.pdf](#)

[Spaulding-Rachel-SA339-SP18.pdf](#)

[Spaulding-Rachel-SA379-SP18.pdf](#)

[Spaulding-Rachel-SA466-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

FL 540: Foreign Language Teaching Methodology

SA 110: Spanish Language and Culture I

Summary 2018

BA in Modern Languages (Spanish) assessment continues, especially in a robust way in our early and intermediate language classes. With the advent of hybrid, "enhanced" classes, we are keeping close track of trends in that area, as we work to grow our program. The enhanced language classes combine a focus of online instruction (mainly for quizzes, exams, and daily work) in English and an all-Spanish (target language) in-class experience. This is a change aimed at becoming more current pedagogically. This change includes adaptations for assessment, such as "sandbox" Canvas sections, which can be observed by all Modern Languages regular faculty and the chair in addition to the instructor. Prof. Rachel Spaulding has developed all of the pedagogical program work for these enhanced classes.

Attached Files

[Perez-Luisa-SA110-FA17.pdf](#)

[Spaulding-Rachel-SA339-SP18.pdf](#)

[Robinson-Gregory-SA210-FA17.pdf](#)

[Spaulding-Rachel-SA313-FA17.pdf](#)

[Perez-Luisa-SA110-SU17.pdf](#)

[Spaulding-Rachel-SA379-SP18.pdf](#)

[Spaulding-Rachel-SA466-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary 2019

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary 2020

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Modern Languages and Literature BA

Responsible Roles: Kevin Rabas (E10000565), Luisa Perez (E10000081)

UNIT REPORT

Assessment Report Interdisciplinary Studies 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 10:50 AM

**Interdisciplinary Studies Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

We are continuing to focus on the improvements to the ID 302 and ID 490 courses with the intention to create alignment between the learning experiences to take advantage of preparing students for successful completion of the program. Individual course embedded assessments will be completed and reported over the 2018 academic year. See the preparation completed in the summer of 2017 to position our yearly assessment efforts.

In summer of 2017, we conducted the following assessments of the program:

1. Following discussions of the relationship between the two required courses, ID 302, Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies and ID 490, BID Capstone, and in response to student comments, we continue to work on finding ways to make the introductory course a better preparation for the capstone course. Most of the students in the program have no experience with grant proposal writing and many of them are quite anxious about what a proposal requires when they start the capstone course. The students now use the same textbook for both classes, and are therefore reviewing the information about the integrative process they learn in the introductory class. We still have work to do to help them understand how to incorporate their various interest areas into a real-life activity (writing a grant proposal), building on the series of assignments in the introductory class to complete the assignments in the capstone class.

Also in response to student comments, the capstone course now also includes a textbook on proposal writing, and most of the course assignments come directly from that text. This academic year, the capstone course will also include, for the first time, video lectures on what it means to write a grant proposal. Plans to include the portfolio from the introductory course as a means to guide the proposal have proven to be more problematic than first estimated. Some of the students in the capstone course completed the introductory course in the previous semester, but many of them took it a year or more ago, before the course had changed (as described in the 2015 assessment plan), and long enough ago that their own interests have changed. Therefore while the concepts they learned in the introductory course remain relevant, the assignments they completed regarding a possible topic for their capstone project are likely out of date.

One possible way to assist students to better utilizing the information from the introductory course would be to have them create an online portfolio in Canvas where they can upload information from the courses they take which might serve as foundations for a capstone project. Online portfolios are gaining in popularity in a variety of settings, including university courses. As students are exposed to more courses that require a portfolio, they will grow more accustomed to maintaining one throughout their college experience. The introductory course would be able to reinforce the idea that a college portfolio is useful, and that the portfolio allows them to see how their courses are integrated. By the time they reach the capstone course, whether the semester following the introductory course or several years later, they would have built a portfolio that provides that foundation.

2. Reviewing syllabi from the top ten courses taken by BID students (SD 550, MG 301, MK 301, PI 301, SD 560, HI 302, IT 325, PE 305, EL 310, HI 412) reveals that courses from across campus have interdisciplinary student learning outcomes that are relevant to the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree. A partial list includes the following.

From MK 301: Describe and integrate the dynamic environment(s) in which marketing decisions must be made; analyze the role of research and information systems in supporting marketing efforts.

From MG 301: Address issues in the social environment; complete a report analyzing the pros and cons of teamwork; explain topics such as NAFTA . . . the WTO, the EU and other significant [global] topics.

From SD 550: Identify the philosophical, historical, and theoretical foundation of education and special education; demonstrate the legal issues and ethical standards for sound education practices; complete activities demonstrating skills needed for collaboration in education settings; demonstrate a commitment to using self-reflection when addressing the needs and abilities of diverse learners.

From IT 325: Be able to integrate technology into a lesson/unit using tenets of universal design for learning; describe uses of technology for

interdisciplinary classroom learning.

From PI 301: To enhance the abilities to read, think, and write clearly in a philosophical way; to be able to . . . understand moral perspectives other than your own; recognize and distinguish between different approaches to ethics.

From HI 412: Comprehend the cultural, economic, social, and political origins of political violence throughout modern world history, especially in the Middle East; understand evolutionary social change as a result of post colonialism and technological advances.

From HI 302: Investigate selected important historical topics such as: gender, class, race, labor history, social history, and more.

From IR 301: Explain how political, social, economic, and environmental factors influence information use, services, and technologies; describe the fundamental ethical and legal issues associated with the access, organization, and use of information.

The intent of this ongoing review is to examine how BID program learning outcomes relate to, support, and are supported by the listed outcomes in courses from other disciplines. This will be followed by discussion among BID instructors regarding how to help students better understand the integrative process and the value of interdisciplinarity. That is an ongoing process that is just now (fall 2017) getting underway. It is always frustrating when students do not make connections between classes and do not see the value of a prerequisite class to the following class. This sort of work on the part of instructors could have ramifications across campus and throughout the students' academic careers.

AY 2017

DIS 2016-17 Assessment Plan Update

January 13, 2017

The first and most basic learning outcome for the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree program is that students completing the program will “demonstrate understanding of the basic concepts of interdisciplinarity and the integrative process.” In pursuit of this outcome, students are encouraged to take classes in two or more interest areas and to focus on understanding how their interest areas interact, complement, and support each other.

In the introduction to interdisciplinary studies class required of all BID students, the instructor requires students to create a portfolio containing information including syllabi, assignments, and papers from their courses used to meet degree requirements. Assignments are focused on the integrative process, encouraging students to gain an understanding of how an interdisciplinary approach can be successful in dealing with complex problems. The integrative process assignments in the introductory course are designed to prepare the students for the capstone course, the other required course in the degree program.

The capstone course, completely revised in spring 2016 and undergoing continual assessment and adjustment since then, requires students to design a project that addresses a complex social problem and to write a grant proposal (to an imaginary funding agency) to fund the project. The project proposals are meant to incorporate the various disciplines in the students' interest areas and to show explicitly how an interdisciplinary approach is a good way to work on such complex problems.

In spring of 2017 we plan to assess the program in two main ways.

1. First. We are discussing the relationship between the two required courses, ID 302, Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies and ID 490, BID Capstone. We continue to work on finding ways to make the introductory course a better preparation for the capstone course. Most of the students in the program have no experience with grant proposal writing and many of them are quite anxious about what a proposal requires when they start the capstone course. In our discussions, the two instructors have worked to increase students' confidence about designing a project and writing a proposal to fund it. For the first time in spring of 2017, the students will use the same textbook for both classes, and therefore will be reviewing the information about the integrative process they learn in the introductory class in the capstone course. This is one step that will, we hope, help them see how to incorporate their various interest areas into a real-life activity (writing a grant proposal), building on the series of assignments in the introductory class to complete the assignments in the capstone class.

In response to student comments, the capstone course now also includes a textbook on proposal writing, and most of the course assignments come directly from that text. Additional readings will come from the former textbook used in the capstone course on interdisciplinary research, as students have expressed a desire to know more about that process.

We are also discussing how the student portfolios created in the introductory course can be used in the capstone course, both as part of the project proposal students write and as a final requirement for the BID degree. This will be part of the capstone course for the first time in spring 2017, and we will request student feedback about the usefulness of continuing the portfolio into their last semester. The portfolios can be created and saved in the Canvas program so students can access them while they are working on their degrees, regardless of how many

semesters might separate the introductory course and the capstone course. They will be encouraged in the introductory course to save papers and assignments from all their subsequent courses so they have a sense of the interdisciplinary nature of their studies in the program.

2. Second. We have created an excel spreadsheet of all the courses taken by BID students from fall 2014 to spring 2016 (a total of 89 students included) to satisfy the BID program requirements. This spreadsheet is included as a document in the evidence file. It clearly shows that students take courses from across campus, with concentrations in certain disciplines. Interestingly, the course taken by more students than any other during that time period is SD 550, Survey of Exceptionality, offered by the Teachers College. Other disciplines represented in the top courses taken by BID students include management and marketing, philosophy, history, physical education, information resource studies, psychology, sociology and elementary education.

This spring we will examine the learning outcomes included in the syllabi for the top ten courses taken by BID students^[i] to determine how the courses contribute (or do not) to the program learning outcomes for the BID. This activity will help us understand how courses from across campus help our students achieve the program outcomes established for the BID. Courses from other programs and departments do not necessarily have any outcomes that explicitly address interdisciplinary studies, and it will be interesting and illuminating to see how the outcomes listed in course syllabi from other departments and programs might actually complement the BID program's learning outcomes.

As we gather information from this exercise we will further examine the BID program learning outcomes. Our goal is to make the learning outcomes realistic and to determine how to help students understand the value of an interdisciplinary approach in their studies. If we, as instructors in the BID program, can gain a better understanding of the intended learning outcomes in the courses our students take most, we can make adjustments in how we work to help students better understand the value of interdisciplinary studies.

[i] SD 550, MG 301, MK 301, PI 301, SD 560, HI 302, IT 325, PE 305, EL 310, HI 412.

AY 2016

We have conducted assessments of the two required courses in the BID program, ID 302, Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies, and ID 490, BID Capstone course. Student learning outcomes for each course were rewritten to reflect the analysis performed in spring 2014.

We gathered information about courses taken by BID students from fall 2014 to spring 2016. Included in this analysis was a list of all the courses in that time period that are listed on BID student contracts (that is, the upper-level courses BID students use to complete the BID program). The table listing the courses by the percentage of BID students including them in their BID contract is included in the evidence files. It clearly shows that BID students take courses from across campus, from all ESU colleges. We find some concentration in courses taught in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (Sociology, History, English, Political Science, Communication, Geography, Anthropology), and in the School of Business (Marketing and Management). But BID students take classes from all programs on campus, depending on their areas of interest.

We plan to review the student learning outcomes for a selection of these courses and to use the information posted in course syllabi to guide students as they select courses to be included in their program contract.

AY 2015

In spring of 2014 an analysis of various aspects of the program was completed. We studied student demographics, number of available online courses, and listed courses (on campus and online) most frequently taken by BID students. An analysis of the two required courses in the BID program was performed and one of the strategies that will be addressed is designing a set of common student learning outcomes for the capstone course. This step will assist those faculty members in various disciplines in facilitating research projects for BID students working on their capstone projects.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

In the ID302 Introduction to IDS class, students reported a mediocre level of understanding of the integrative process, especially connecting the different steps.

AY 2017

DIS 2017 Assessment Plan Update

In summer of 2017 we conducted the following assessments of the program.

1. Following discussions of the relationship between the two required courses, ID 302, Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies and ID 490, BID Capstone, and in response to student comments, we continue to work on finding ways to make the introductory course a better preparation for the capstone course. Most of the students in the program have no experience with grant proposal writing and many of them are quite anxious about what a proposal requires when they start the capstone course. The students now use the same textbook for both classes, and are therefore reviewing the information about the integrative process they learn in the introductory class. We still have work to do to help them understand how to incorporate their various interest areas into a real-life activity (writing a grant proposal), building on the series of assignments in the introductory class to complete the assignments in the capstone class.

Also in response to student comments, the capstone course now also includes a textbook on proposal writing, and most of the course assignments come directly from that text. This academic year, the capstone course will also include, for the first time, video lectures on what it means to write a grant proposal. Plans to include the portfolio from the introductory course as a means to guide the proposal have proven to be more problematic than first estimated. Some of the students in the capstone course completed the introductory course in the previous semester, but many of them took it a year or more ago, before the course had changed (as described in the 2015 assessment plan), and long enough ago that their own interests have changed. Therefore while the concepts they learned in the introductory course remain relevant, the assignments they completed regarding a possible topic for their capstone project are likely out of date.

One possible way to assist students to better utilizing the information from the introductory course would be to have them create an online portfolio in Canvas where they can upload information from the courses they take which might serve as foundations for a capstone project. Online portfolios are gaining in popularity in a variety of settings, including university courses. As students are exposed to more courses that require a portfolio, they will grow more accustomed to maintaining one throughout their college experience. The introductory course would be able to reinforce the idea that a college portfolio is useful, and that the portfolio allows them to see how their courses are integrated. By the time they reach the capstone course, whether the semester following the introductory course or several years later, they would have built a portfolio that provides that foundation.

2. Reviewing syllabi from the top ten courses taken by BID students (SD 550, MG 301, MK 301, PI 301, SD 560, HI 302, IT 325, PE 305, EL 310, HI 412) reveals that courses from across campus have interdisciplinary student learning outcomes that are relevant to the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies degree. A partial list includes the following.

From MK 301: Describe and integrate the dynamic environment(s) in which marketing decisions must be made; analyze the role of research and information systems in supporting marketing efforts.

From MG 301: Address issues in the social environment; complete a report analyzing the pros and cons of teamwork; explain topics such as NAFTA . . . the WTO, the EU and other significant [global] topics.

From SD 550: Identify the philosophical, historical, and theoretical foundation of education and special education; demonstrate the legal issues and ethical standards for sound education practices; complete activities demonstrating skills needed for collaboration in education settings; demonstrate a commitment to using self-reflection when addressing the needs and abilities of diverse learners.

From IT 325: Be able to integrate technology into a lesson/unit using tenets of universal design for learning; describe uses of technology for interdisciplinary classroom learning.

From PI 301: To enhance the abilities to read, think, and write clearly in a philosophical way; to be able to . . . understand moral perspectives other than your own; recognize and distinguish between different approaches to ethics.

From HI 412: Comprehend the cultural, economic, social, and political origins of political violence throughout modern world history, especially in the Middle East; understand evolutionary social change as a result of post colonialism and technological advances.

From HI 302: Investigate selected important historical topics such as: gender, class, race, labor history, social history, and more.

From IR 301: Explain how political, social, economic, and environmental factors influence information use, services, and technologies; describe the fundamental ethical and legal issues associated with the access, organization, and use of information.

The intent of this ongoing review is to examine how BID program learning outcomes relate to, support, and are supported by the listed outcomes in courses from other disciplines. This will be followed by discussion among BID instructors regarding how to help students better understand the integrative process and the value of interdisciplinarity. That is an ongoing process that is just now (fall 2017) getting underway. It is always frustrating when students do not make connections between classes and do not see the value of a prerequisite class to the following class. This sort of work on the part of instructors could have ramifications across campus and throughout the students' academic careers.

AY2017 LEARNING IMPROVEMENT STRATEGIES

Student comments on ID 490, summer 2017

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

What students found most difficult:

1. The level of detail required in each assignment and the final proposal
2. Completing the many pieces of the proposal
3. Finding information for the background section
4. Determining the purpose of the proposal
5. Choosing a good topic for the project proposal
6. Narrowing the topic from big ideas to a smaller, narrower idea
7. Writing the individual pieces, specifically mentioned were the plan for disseminating results (students did not know what "disseminating" results meant); developing the budget for the project; developing the timeline for implementation.

Students' suggestions for changes:

1. More opportunities to communicate with fellow students about work on the proposal, including more discussion forums or Zoom video conferences.
2. Form small groups that can work together on the proposal.
3. More guidance on choosing a topic
4. Information about the difference between writing a proposal and writing a research paper.
5. Provide examples of grant proposals.

In response to students' comments and suggestions, the following changes will be adopted in fall 2017.

I have posted an introductory video on the course website and will continue to post lecture notes via Panopto. As the students tend to not read thoroughly, I am hopeful that explaining assignments, purpose and details will help alleviate some of the confusion and anxiety they express.

During the regular semester (as opposed to the summer session), the students have more discussion forum assignments and are required to respond to my questions and to comment on each others' responses. I will also create a forum that is for the students only, with the assurance that I will not monitor that forum so they are free to post whatever questions they like.

The suggestion that the class be divided into smaller groups to discuss assignments and provide support to each other is a good one, and I will suggest that this semester.

I provide detailed instructions on each assignment as well as detailed responses on all assignments. I will continue to revise the instructions to provide more guidance from the beginning of the project, when the students are choosing a topic for their project proposal.

Although I posted an example of a successful proposal from a previous semester, the students asked for more than one example. I will post an additional example as well as links to online examples of grant proposals the students can review.

With regard to their comments about not being sure about the purpose, the "how" and the "what" of the proposal, I will spend time in the Panopto video lecture notes discussing why proposal writing is a useful skill. I will review other textbooks that may be more clear to the students who are learning to write a grant proposal. The textbook we currently are using is small, concise, and clear, but perhaps another book is available that is even better.

I will continue to seek input from the students throughout the semester, through responses to the videos and through discussion forums.

AY2016

DIS learning improvement strategy

A. Guiding improved student learning for students in the program

Based on the information gathered in academic year 2014-15 and fall 2015, a new capstone course structure was developed. Capstone students now enroll in ID 490 as a single course with the DIS Chair as instructor. This is different from past years when students chose a full-time faculty member to serve as capstone director and supervise preparation of a research paper.

The intention of the capstone remains the same: the students are to focus on how their interdisciplinary coursework informs the approach to a complex problem and allows a more thorough approach to devising solutions. The method of the capstone has changed, however. Rather than write a research paper, students design a project – a research project or an action project – and write a grant proposal. They must write a substantial literature review as part of the proposal (background and rationale), and in addition they develop a set of goals and objectives, a timeline and implementation plan, a monitoring and evaluation plan, a budget, and a plan for dissemination of results.

To continue to emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of the work, students choose a full-time faculty or staff member as an outside reader of the proposal. They consult with that person to help guide them in developing their proposal topic and as they feel comfortable through the semester. The outside reader reviews the first draft of the completed proposal. The course instructor provides a rubric to judge the proposal along with detailed guidelines to the faculty/staff member serving as outside reader. A major difference in this structure is that the capstone instructor assigns the final grade for the capstone course. Feedback from faculty members in the past indicated that many felt uncomfortable providing a grade for the capstone course; they felt that was too big a responsibility to be based on grading a single paper.

Writing a grant proposal rather than a research paper is an exercise in application of a real-world skill that will be of use to students when they graduate. In the first semester of implementation of this new structure, spring 2016, some of the students wrote proposals for projects they hoped to conduct in their professional lives, or for projects they felt were important and plausible at some point in the future. One student found a small community development foundation that accepted funding proposals for one part of the larger project she wanted to pursue, so she prepared her capstone proposal to incorporate that piece. I encouraged her to submit that smaller proposal to the foundation, though I have not heard from her since so I do not know if she did so, or if she was successful. In any case, the experience of writing the larger grant proposal was a useful exercise and provided her the opportunity to prepare the smaller project. In fall 2016, students are encouraged from the start to think about a proposal that they can submit to an actual funding agency, in hopes that their projects will all have real-world applications.

In fall 2016, I will use the technology offered by Canvas to post video comments in response to student comments on the discussion forum and in their assignments. In the online course format it is sometimes difficult to ensure that students read comments on their work and feel like they are receiving adequate feedback. In the comments from spring 2016 many students said they would like to have one-on-one meetings with the instructor, and that they felt instructions were not clear so they felt overwhelmed and like they were floundering. In order to avoid this type of situation, I will work on better communicating with the students by using spoken, rather than written, words.

The students also felt confused by the concept of a grant proposal, even though they received extensive instructions and explicit questions to answer. In fall 2016, therefore, I added a small textbook to introduce them to the concept of writing grant proposals. It is clear already that the students have read the introductory chapters in the textbook, as they are using some of the book's language in their comments in the online discussion forum.

ID 302, Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies

Changes have been made to the introductory course in response to student performance in the past two years and to student comments on course evaluations and during in-class discussions. Recognizing that students felt uncertain about their ability to do interdisciplinary research or to construct complex problems as research topics, Professor Koci has shifted the focus in the course to place greater emphasis on the interdisciplinary research process. New assignments in the course focus on research skills in interdisciplinary research. For example, over the course of several weeks the students work on the Integrative Process Worksheet, a six-part project that encourages them to think about the interdisciplinary research process as a process of integration. They submit the worksheet as six distinct assignments which take them through writing an interdisciplinary question through evaluating the process and then thinking about how the process will continue into the capstone project.

To help students make the transition from the introductory course to the capstone course (which may follow in the next semester or may be separated by a longer period), the students spend time contemplating and writing about coming up with a capstone topic. The worksheet assignment is intended to increase their confidence in their research skills, particularly in interdisciplinary research and scholarly research in preparation for the capstone.

Also in response to student comments, Professor Koci has decreased the introductory class focus on how interdisciplinary studies developed

and changed over the years and has placed more emphasis on the process of interdisciplinary study and research, developing more hands-on, in-class practice of how to do interdisciplinary research through assignments. For example, students conduct a critical analysis of an article to explore how they can be critical of a disciplinary source without discounting it because it is from one discipline.

In comments in the capstone course, some students did discount disciplines for being unable to analyze complex problems. This shows they have a limited view of what disciplines are and what role they play in allowing the students to integrate information, methods and approaches from the different disciplines they have studied. This is an area for more assessment and adjustment. The students need to learn how to using the disciplines in an integrative process to better understand, research and resolve complex problems. The process of integration is difficult for the students, and is among the most challenging concepts to teach in interdisciplinary studies. See the description of the integrative process worksheet assignment below (section c) for more discussion.

B. Connection to ESU Strategic Plan, Goal 1: Pursue distinctive initiatives in curricula and programs that will foster vibrant communities

This section is under construction.

C. What is success and how are we measuring it?

In ID 490, the BID Capstone, student success remains as it has been: the students produce a meaningful proposal that meets the goals of the course learning outcomes, especially as regards their ability to recognize and describe the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to their proposal topic.

Measuring student success is changing, however. Data will be collected from the rubric used by capstone outside readers and the capstone course instructor, who will analyze how well students meet the learning objectives of the capstone course. This has only been started; the rubric was used in spring 2016 and a revised rubric will be used in fall 2016. The revised rubric will be more closely aligned to the course learning outcomes. It will allow collection of relevant data from the instructor and all outside readers each semester so the department will know how well students understand interdisciplinarity and how well they are able to incorporate the principles of an interdisciplinary approach in their work.

In ID 302 the students prepare an IDS portfolio – a competency-based portfolio that demonstrates their ability to perform according to the stated student learning outcomes. The portfolio is designed to showcase the skills students learn in the introductory class, and by completing the portfolio they illustrate their understanding of how their various interdisciplinary interests connect and aid in the greater understanding of complex problems.

The integrative process worksheet mentioned above in section 1 clearly states that integration of the disciplines is a critical part of interdisciplinary research. The last step in the worksheet assignment also makes it clear that the students' work on the assignment should transfer directly to the capstone and serve as a bridge to the capstone project. This is another area for future assessment development, as comments from students in the capstone indicate that they have not been able to make that connection. Professor Koci and I have had conversations about how to better coordinate ID 302 and ID 490, so the students do make those connections. In the future, both classes will probably use the same textbook. Currently the introductory class uses a textbook called *Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies* (Allen F. Repko; Sage, 2014) and the capstone course uses *Interdisciplinary Research* (Allen F. Repko and Rick Szostak, Sage, 2016). The research book duplicates a lot of the information in the introductory book, and we believe might be leading the students to believe that they need to learn everything there is to know about something called "Interdisciplinary Research," rather than learning everything they can about how to do research in general and how to integrate the disciplines so they provide an interdisciplinary approach. Again, the integrative process is a difficult concept for the students to grasp. Using the same textbook for two semesters, we hope, will reinforce the message rather than dilute it.

AY2015

DIS learning improvement strategy

a. how it guides improved student learning for the disciplines/programs within the department New guidelines for students and faculty regarding the BID Capstone focus on the interdisciplinary nature of the capstone project (see description of BID capstone). The point of the capstone is to have the students tie their interest areas together in one final report that shows how an interdisciplinary approach helps the student identify a problem, conduct research, and propose solutions to the problem. BID capstone students choose a full-time faculty member as their capstone director. Faculty members have new guidelines to explain the purpose of the capstone. Greater understanding on the part of faculty capstone directors will help them guide students to produce a meaningful project that shows how their interest areas tie together, how they are using multiple disciplines to conduct research and to propose solutions to the problem they are researching and writing about.

b. make the connection to a goal in the strategic plan and explain the connection

This section currently in progress.

c. define what success is and how success will be measured

Student success in the BID Capstone is their ability to produce a meaningful capstone project that meets the goals of the learning outcomes, especially as regards their ability to recognize and describe the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to their capstone topic. Success will be measured by scores in a rubric prepared by capstone directors that analyzes how well students meet the learning objectives. To date this has not been done. Capstone directors have only given a final grade on each student's capstone project. The rubric will allow collection of relevant data from all directors each semester so the department will know how well students understand interdisciplinarity and how well they are able to incorporate the principles of an interdisciplinary approach in their work.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - BID 2014](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BID 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BID 2016](#)
- [Fall 2014 - Spring 2016 courses taken by BID students](#)
- [BID_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [Bid-Senior-Survey-UG-FA2016-SP2017-SU2017-Grads \(4\)](#)
- [LAS-IS-INTERDISCIPLINARYSTUDIES-BID](#)
- [Analysis of BID program 7-1-2014](#)
- [BID Capstone 2014](#)
- [BID Capstone Course Outcomes 2015](#)
- [BID Capstone Project Guidelines for Directors 2015](#)
- [BID Capstone Project New Guidelines for Students 2015](#)
- [Senior Survey Results for BID Graduates for AY2016](#)
- [Honors Course Assessment for Fall 2015](#)
- [Student Learning Objectives for Course](#)
- [Fall 2014-Spring 2016 Contract Course Stats](#)
- [comments from ID 490, spring 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BID 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Interdisciplinary Studies - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Koci-Mallory-ID301-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Koci-Mallory-ID302-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hansen-Ellen-ID490-SU17.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - BID 2018](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

It is impractical to assess the wide variety of courses that students take in the Interdisciplinary Studies Program because students pursue such different pathways. However, those courses taught by the BID faculty are being assessed regularly and changes have been made to improve the student learning experiences. Adapting the capstone course to bring in multiple strategies to engage students in writing and researching is valuable and makes key contributions to honing application skills and effectively provides a way to unite the variety of academic discipline breadth that is gained by completing the BID degree. The course embedded assessment reporting tool can be valuable by providing assessment results for common courses that are being assessed in the other disciplines. Since academic year 2017 was the first year for faculty reporting course level assessment results using the tool, the number of courses is minimal, but over time there should be a variety of assessment reports available to identify student learning improvement strategies in those most common courses. The 2018 addition of the General Studies program will present the same program level assessment challenges that are noted in the Interdisciplinary Studies program. The positive note is that both of these degrees are designed to allow students to build their own curriculum preferences and these pathways are unique in and of themselves. All of the courses the students choose are part of the program review and assessment processes in the programs where they reside, so the courses are being assessed on a regular cyclical basis. Continued semester assessments and reporting of the ID introductory and capstone courses is encouraged. Keeping a record of the most common courses being taken by majors should be continued, as the university continues to add more online courses the list of common courses will most likely change. Keep up your valuable assessment practices and always strive to find those few key things to change that will improve student learning in those courses you have control over.

Academic Year 2017

In reviewing the assessment planning and implementation, you are doing a nice job of analyzing the situation for how students are navigating

the interdisciplinarity of their curriculum, identifying the courses that are most common among your students, and the learning outcomes affiliated with these courses that present as interdisciplinary. You are doing a good job of working to create some symmetry between the ID302 introduction course and the ID490 capstone course. I like the idea of the portfolio approach this way students can identify some of their best works and keep them for further review or to show to a potential employer (exemplary works). The identification of the key (most frequently chosen) courses and affiliated student learning outcomes will provide a much better understanding of the content knowledge and skill sets students have when they are ready to complete the capstone grant writing project. I can sense there is a frustration in the students abilities to understand the particulars of the grant writing assignments. You are doing what you can to incorporate some of the skills into the introductory course, but like you said, the timing of when the Introductory course was taken can be a barrier, since the alignment of the project assignments has occurred just recently. This part of the issue will work itself out over time. I think that you are taking an appropriate approach by coordinating the courses and this should produce higher levels of student success. I would be willing to say that the ID490 capstone course is the only time the student is assigned to write a grant proposal as a major project. With that said, your approach to assigning a grant writing text is a good one. Using the same text for both the ID302 and ID490 courses is a great strategy, as well. You mentioned that student feedback supported a second example of a grant proposal. You probably already do this, but assigning students to critique the key components of the example proposals may provide a richer understanding of how to approach their own grant proposals. You could also have group critique discussion sessions tying the specifics of the text to the example proposals. Just my thoughts on how to get students engaged in some higher order thinking that may benefit the quality of their proposals. Overall, you have used those assessment practices that are providing some excellent quantitative and qualitative data to support your strategies and change efforts. You should know quite a bit more after implementing your 2018 student learning improvement strategies. Your creativity in approaching assessment of the BID program through multiple perspectives is a strength. Your interdisciplinary approach is unique and sharing what you have learned from your assessment practices and the related contributions to student success is important. Keep up the excellent work and continue to reflect on the complexities of assisting students in completing an interdisciplinary curriculum. Thank you for sharing!

Academic Year 2016

The evolution of how students learn in both of the ID 302 and ID 490 courses is evidence that sincere assessment efforts have led to changes. These changes appear to involve students being more interactive in their learning assignments. The most substantial change where the ID 490 students are supervised in their grant proposal by the instructor with a supporting role being held by another faculty member is a great strategy based on the result of past assessments where there was quite a bit of variability in the expectations of supervising faculty members although there was a rubric to be employed when assigning feedback and grades. This change in itself should prove beneficial in confirming the rigor of the student learning experience in the course.

The discussion board comments from students for those ID 490 course and the associated change strategies was such sound assessment work using student feedback to analyze the pulse of the course over time, how awesome. It was so interesting reading about how students were critically thinking about how they approached the course and research/grant writing project. They responded back and forth and had some really good ideas about how to strengthen the course. Including students in the assessment process is one of the best practices you can employ and your students served a key role in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the course. Maybe in the future using the skype or other real time video interactions can enable the student instructor or student to student interaction for those students who are not located on campus. IT has a lot of support for these type of instruction challenges, you may want to reach out to them for suggestions or help in setting these interactions up electronically.

The Honors Course assessment narrative does a good job of describing the connections between the course curriculum and the honors course objectives. Adding in the rubric used with the data from scoring students works would be a nice attachment the next time the assessment plan is updated. If the course is taught multiple semesters, the data results over time may be beneficial in comparing how change strategies have impacted the students' learning.

A suggestion for the upcoming year is to develop rubrics to score student learning of the objectives and concepts reviewed in the honors course and the ethics and identity course. The process of matching assignments and the group work in the course with the objectives and learning outcomes (as has been done) and scoring students efforts and works to the rubrics can create a numerical representation of what areas students are achieving at expectations and to also identify areas for improvement. If you would like assistance in these efforts, I'm willing to help. Throughout the assessment report, there is good evidence of change strategies being employed to improve the student learning experience. Keep up the good work!

Academic Year 2015

The BID program is unique and presents a complex assessment situation. There are two required courses BID graduates must complete successfully (ID 302, Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies and ID 490, Interdisciplinary Studies Capstone Project). For the ID 302 course, the student learning outcomes should be positioned in a rubric where alignment with the course content and syllabi is shown. To make assessment practical only choose one or two of the learning outcomes for assessment at a time, then rotate the learning outcomes for assessment as needed. Cyclical assessment of select course student learning outcomes can be rotated annually or every other year and over

time all learning outcomes are assessed and the learning experience continuously improves. Ongoing assessment of the introductory course will enable the program to adapt to the ever changing environment of interdisciplinary studies. For the capstone course, student learning objectives and capstone rigor expectations have been determined (per attached evidence documents). Depending upon a variety of faculty directors to engage students in their capstone work creates some ambiguities in trying to provide a one-size fits all rubric for scoring student works. I'm envisioning a rubric that lists those important qualities that a BID graduate has mastered and allows the flexibility of the faculty director to more specifically define those appropriate to the project. In addition, the rubric would be dynamic and would be used as a tool for the faculty director and student to come to agreement on expected performance on the capstone project. Thus, the rubric would serve the purpose of overall scoring of students projects works across multiple disciplines over time and also as a planning tool for the faculty director and student to align purpose and expectations for their capstone projects. We can work together on this rubric project and learning outcomes descriptions for the introductory course as well.

Providing Department: Interdisciplinary Studies

Responsible Roles: Mallory Koci (E10000251), Ellen Hansen (E10000958)

UNIT REPORT

Mathematics and Economics Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 10:57 AM

**Mathematics and Economics Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

This year our department will continue two methods of assessment that we believe to be effective:

- holding exit interviews with graduating students,
- conducting faculty forums.

Here are our assessment plans at the program level:

Undergraduate program in Economics:

Calculus - Our assessment will focus on selected parts of the mathematics assessment already being conducted for the undergraduate program in mathematics.

Basic Economics - This is the beginning course recommended for economics majors based on previous assessment. It is a foundation course upon which other economics courses build; however, many economics majors have not solidified their choice of a major before beginning EC101.

Undergraduate program in Mathematics and Mathematics Education:

The Undergraduate Mathematics and Mathematics Education Curriculum Committee has developed an assessment plan for the 2017-2018 that involves MA 125 Introduction to Mathematics, the calculus sequence (MA 161, MA 262, and MA 363), and MA 460 History of Math. In MA 125, the students completed a questionnaire at the beginning of the semester. A similar questionnaire will be administered during the last week of the semester to gauge the effectiveness of the class. In the calculus sequence, students will be given a quiz as part of their preparation for the final exam. This quiz will be used to determine if the course outcomes are being met. As for MA 460, a student project will be accessed to determine if students can discuss mathematics in historical context, which is a major outcome for the course. By the end of the 2017-2018, the committee will review the data to determine if changes need to be made to the courses that are under review.

Graduate program in Mathematics:

We will focus on the three content areas of our program: analysis, algebra, and statistics/applied mathematics. Since we require students to take at least one course from each area in order to complete the degree, the committee decided to choose one course from each area each year for assessment. This year we will be gathering data from MA701, MA735 (for Analysis area), MA741 (for Algebra area), and MA532 (for Statistics/Applied area).

In addition to assessing particular courses, we have created a new rubric for evaluating student seminar presentations. We continue to use performance on comprehensive exams to assess content retention at the end of the program.

AY 2017

This year the department's assessment process will continue some practices that we believe to be effective, as well as adding a few items. For example, we plan to distribute a survey to gain feedback from alumni. We also plan to interview graduating seniors and conduct focus groups based on major. See below for the specifics for each program.

Undergraduate program in mathematics/mathematics education:

In addition to the assessment work done by Dr. Connie Schrock for KSDE, we plan to...

- Create an alumni survey and analyze the results.

- Conduct senior exit interviews as a focus group discussion and analyze the results.
 - Hold a faculty forum to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the program.
 - Analyze proof-writing ability at the end of Discrete Mathematics (MA240).
- The Undergraduate Committee will make recommendations based on the results of the above efforts.

Undergraduate program in economics:

Since the linkage study will no longer be possible in the future, we plan to...

- Create an alumni survey and analyze the results.
 - Conduct senior interviews and a focus group discussion specific to economics and analyze the results.
- As our department's only economist, Rob Catlett, will decide the appropriate course of action based on the results of the above efforts. We are in the process of hiring another economist and hope this individual will be in place by August 2017. This outside perspective will aid our assessment process in future years.

Graduate program in mathematics:

We plan to...

- Create a student survey with Canvas and analyze the results.
- Hold a faculty forum to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the program. Continue to collect data from the comprehensive exams and analyze the results.
- Continue to collect data from the comprehensive exams and analyze the results.

The Graduate Committee will make recommendations based on the results of the above efforts.

AY2016

The following provides a general overview of the department-level student learning improvement plan. It includes intertemporal plans and actions that follow assessment findings within the department as well as university-led initiatives. The department-level student learning improvement goal for the upcoming year is to find ways to add value to the graduate-level Informatics initiative in light of the faculty and classroom resource constraints. This is a stretch goal and is heavily integrated with other departments and disciplines. It is contingent on the university following through on this initiative. Complementary programs related to actuarial science and quantitative economics are contingent on the university. This goal is closely aligned with the ESU Strategic Plan, The Adaptive University and specifically aligns with two goals:

1. GOAL 1: Pursue distinctive initiatives in curricula and programs that will foster vibrant communities. The roles of economics and especially mathematics would seem to be essential in this distinctive initiative because it is classified as a STEM area.
2. GOAL 3: Enhance the competitive role of Kansas by achieving the State's goals for public higher education. The programs in the department, especially in mathematics education and economics play a significant role in the competitive position of the Kansas economy.

The Kansas Board of Regents goals are outlined in FORESIGHT 2020.

1. IMPROVE ECONOMIC ALIGNMENT
2. Measures (FORESIGHT 2020)
3. Performance of students on institutional assessments in three areas:
 1. Mathematics/Quantitative/Analytical Reasoning,
 2. Written and Oral Communication, and
 3. Critical Thinking/Problem Solving.
 4. Percent graduates employed in Kansas post-graduation.
 5. Average wages earned by graduates post-graduation.
 6. Performance of students on selected third-party technical program certificate/credential assessments.
 7. Number of certificates and degrees awarded in selected high-demand occupations.
 8. Percent of credentials awarded in STEM fields.

ESU Measures and Data Success is:

- Implementation of the graduate-level certificate program in mathematics (This automatically increase vii and viii in Foresight 2020, so listing additional metrics for measuring success of these would be artificial.)
- Offering a new course or expanded set of elements in course as well as new course offerings related to Informatics are part of

the package. Once again this is consistent with the university moving forward with the initiative.

- Specifically, at least two Honors courses should be offered that are accessible to highly talented non-majors (i.e., few specific prerequisites).
- Use linkage studies to assess undergraduate student learning in mathematical and quantitative reasoning.
- Success is having 90 percent or more of undergraduates who take both the ACT math and CAAP math and maintain a major in the department achieving “Expected Progress” or “More than Expected Progress” in terms of their relative decile achievement on the CAAP (math) compared with the ACT (math). Use linkage studies to assess undergraduate student learning in English usage. Success is having 90 percent or more of undergraduate economics majors who take both the ACT and CAAP exams in English achieving "Expected Progress" or "More than Expected Progress" in terms of their relative decile comparison (i.e., student learning).
- Measurement and achievement of these goals depends on approval by regulatory bodies (e.g., LA&S, ESU Graduate College, Kansas Board of Regents) as well as access to the data collected by other entities (e.g., career services, IR)
- Measurement and achievement of the KBOR goals related to the certificates and degrees awarded as well as the percent of degree awarded in STEM areas is not duplicated in this report since it is available on the dashboard and elsewhere. It might be noted that economics in the Department of Mathematics and Economics at ESU could be classified as quantitative economics (and econometrics), which is with the STEM area in most US government designations. Moreover, the assessment of critical thinking in part has been reported as part of the ESU General Education Program for EC101, so it is not duplicated here.
- The overarching goal solidified as the result of the annual department strategic planning retreat as well as subsequent meetings of the faculty along with meetings with the dean of LA&S. The Assessment Forum continues to be a highlight with the department's faculty participating in the most enthusiastic manner of all assessment activities. The combined activities of the department related to assessment activities, the ESU and department's strategic plans, and FORESIGHT 2020 have improved. The department continues to have program goals that align with the university's Strategic Plan and FORESIGHT 2020.

AY2015

The department-level student learning improvement plan includes the following: The overarching department-level student learning improvement goal for the upcoming year is to expand initiatives in the curriculum to foster improved access to analytical, quantitative, or mathematical erudition.

This goal is aligned with the new ESU Strategic Plan The Adaptive University Specifically, it aligns with two goals:

1. GOAL 1: Pursue distinctive initiatives in curricula and programs that will foster vibrant communities.
2. GOAL 3: Enhance the competitive role of Kansas by achieving the State's goals for public higher education.

The Kansas Board of Regents goals are outlined in FORESIGHT 2020 (the ones in bold apply)

1. IMPROVE ECONOMIC ALIGNMENT
2. Measures (FORESIGHT 2020)
3. Performance of students on institutional assessments in three areas:
 - Mathematics/Quantitative/Analytical Reasoning
 - Written and Oral Communication,
 - Critical Thinking/Problem Solving.
 - Percent graduates employed in Kansas post graduation.
 - Average wages earned by graduates post graduation.
 - Performance of students on selected third-party technical program certificate/credential assessments.
 - Number of certificates and degrees awarded in selected high-demand occupations. Percent of credentials awarded in STEM fields.
 - ESU Measures and Data Success is: Development of a graduate-level certificate program in mathematics (This should automatically increase vii and viii in Foresight 2020, so listing additional metrics for measuring success of these would be artificial.)
 - Offering a new course or expanded set of course offerings Specifically, at least two Honors courses should be offered that are accessible to highly talented non-majors (i.e., few specific prerequisites).
 - Use linkage studies to assess undergraduate student learning in mathematical and quantitative reasoning.
 - Success is having 90 percent or more of undergraduates who take both the ACT math and CAAP math and maintain an major in the department achieving “Expected Progress” or “More than Expected Progress” in terms of their relative decile achievement on the CAAP (math) compared with the ACT (math).
 - Measurement and achievement of these goals depends on approval by regulatory bodies (e.g., LA&S, ESU Graduate College, Kansas Board of Regents) as well as access to the data collected by other entities (e.g., career services, IR)
 - Reflection on the goal and its achievement The overarching goal solidified as the result of the annual department Assessment

Forum. It combines the department's assessment activities, the new ESU Strategic Plan, and FORESIGHT 2020. The department has program goals that align with other aspects of these both the Strategic Plan and FORESIGHT 2020.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

Economics BS

The department made progress on all three 2017-2018 objectives for the economics program.

1. Economics courses continue to use student feedback to guide course goals and outcomes.
2. Bekah Selby created syllabi for 12 new courses for the Quantitative Economics concentration of the Informatics degree. Some of these courses are also available to the undergraduate economics major.
3. A 5-year assessment plan was created. In particular, 100-level courses were evaluated in Year 2. No major concerns were identified.

Exit interviews with graduating seniors identified civic engagement and presentations as strengths of the program.

Action steps for AY2019 include:

- Continue to find opportunities for civic engagement for economics majors.
- Continue to require presentations in some courses.
- Change the live lectures in hybrid classes to be pre-recorded, thus allowing live interactions with students to focus on applications.

Mathematics BS/BSE

The department made progress on all three 2017-2018 objectives for the undergraduate mathematics program.

1. Revisions to the topics covered in the Calculus sequence was implemented this year. The gateways proved effective for improving students' performance on skill-based items. Results were mixed for items that were conceptual or applied. The actual success of the re-sequencing won't be known until students take Calculus III next year. We plan to continue the conversation about the Calculus sequence after collecting more data.
2. The Huntley Scholarship was offered to 12 prospective students. As of May 17, four had enrolled.
3. MA130, Problem Solving with Computers, was identified as a course of concern in various exit interviews and last year's alumni survey. This course is scheduled to be revamped for Fall 2018. Tom Mahoney will teach the course using Python. We plan to assess this course next year. However, it will take a few years to truly know if the changes made were successful.

MA125, Introduction to Mathematics, and MA460, History of Mathematics, were also assessed this year. No major concerns were identified. Minor changes may be implemented in MA125.

Action steps for AY2019 include:

- Continue to monitor the changes made to the Calculus sequence
- Assess the changes made to MA130, Problem Solving with Computers.
- Assess the other Year 3 courses in the program. (These are the core applied courses.)

Mathematics MS

The department made progress on all three 2017-2018 objectives for the graduate mathematics program. In particular:

1. The lightboard continues to get good use among some faculty and receives positive reviews from students.
2. In the last year, we changed our enrollment procedures to prevent students from "squatting" seats in many courses and preventing others from registering. Now students fill out preference forms to state which courses they would like to enroll in, capped at a maximum of two courses initially. Students are placed in courses based on the number of credit hours they have completed. Feedback regarding this change has been positive. Students like that they do not have to be online at the exact right time in order to register. For the Spring 2018 semester, 90% of students were placed in both their first and second choice courses, with 95% students getting into at two of their top three.
3. For the Fall 2017 semester, we implemented a new rubric to score the MA810 seminars in the categories of mathematical content, use of language, central result, organization, and visual aids. Each category is scored as 0 (below expectations), 1 (benchmark), 2

(milestone), or 3 (exemplary). Median scores of 2 for each category are considered satisfactory. Attendance increased slightly, but we would still like to improve in this area.

Additionally, we built a minicourse in Canvas for new graduate students to introduce them to enrollment procedures, writing in LaTeX, how to navigate Canvas, and go over some background mathematics that is useful in many courses.

Action steps for AY2019 include:

- Create a “boot camp” for new students
- Explore strategies to increase seminar attendance
- Find a better way to track data on acceptance, enrollment, and graduation rates.

AY 2017

Economics program:

This year an alumni survey and a student focus group were used to collect data and feedback. During the focus group, students determined the goals and outcomes for the program for next year. Both graduating seniors and alumni gave the economics program very positive feedback. The only concerns that were raised will be more easily addressed with a second faculty member who was hired this past year.

Action steps for AY2018 include:

- Implement the goals and outcomes created by students.
- Rob Catlett and new hire, Bekah Selby, will design future courses in response to student and alumni feedback
- Rob and Bekah will create a 5-year assessment plan.

Mathematics (BS/BSE) program:

The department made progress on two of three 2016-2017 objectives. One highlight of the year was the proposed revision of the calculus sequence which will be implemented in Fall 2017. Another highlight was the results of the alumni survey which showed recent graduates are quite satisfied with the education they received from the department. Out of 33 responses, 29 gave the department an "A" and four assigned a "B."

Action steps for 2017-2018 include:

- Implement revisions to the calculus sequence.
- Recruit additional mathematics majors through the creation and promotion of a scholarship program for incoming students.
- Promote and reevaluate technology and programming opportunities for students.

Mathematics (MS) program:

The department made progress on all four 2016-2017 objectives. One highlight of the year was the implementation of the lightboard for lecturing which received positive reviews from online students. Another highlight was a potential solution to the scheduling issues that have been the primary student concern since the demand for the program accelerated. It is worth noting that overall satisfaction with the program is high, with a median rating of 9/10 from a recent survey of active students. One continued challenge is the unevenness of seminars, as well as low attendance.

Here are our action steps for the 2017-2018 year:

- Encourage wider adoption of the lightboard.
- Implement a priority enrollment system for Spring 2018 enrollment.
- Improve quality and attendance of seminars. (This will be accomplished using an updated rubric that can be completed by multiple attendees.)

AY2016

The department is keenly aware that the number of students taking the CAAP tests related to communication skills and math and quantitative reasoning will diminish. These have been important elements (i.e., linkage studies) in the departments assessment programs for math and especially economics. It will be extremely challenging to replace these external direct assessments of student learning because they have a pretest-like element beginning before typical college matriculation. The challenge, especially in economics is to find access to similar data that allows individual student learning comparisons that can be aggregated. It is important to remember that students have little if any

exposure to economics courses in Kansas K-12 schools. Subsequently students enter the program at different stages of their collegiate career, which makes a similar pretest virtually impossible without some contamination of the data (e.g., some students have more collegiate experience before anyone, including the students themselves, might be tested. Regardless, the department recognizes and respects the decision of the university to make such changes like these.

The department has been developing new databases that provide new measurement of student learning in both economics and math undergraduate programs. The math database focusing on the formation of proofs is now adequate to decipher trends. Although this is not perfect since students are not required to take Discrete Math at a prescribed sequence in the program, enough students take it after the analysis (i.e., calculus) sequence that useful information is available. It is important to note, the department faculty have a long history of allowing students to challenge themselves to excel in areas and courses by allowing them to take more advanced classes than otherwise might be indicated by simple metrics or algorithms.

The economics database is relatively robust in assessing student performance in micro and macro economics, which are the core elements of economics. The rubrics and details should be self-explanatory to faculty.

In addition, the department is experimenting more with focus groups related to assessing aggregate student learning. This helps ensure that the level of student performance and student learning align. More importantly, the timing of these focus groups provides an early alert system because of their timing (e.g., early in the semester).

A new alumni survey is under construction and the first responses from it are likely to be available in the 2016-2017 academic year.

The department and its programs are likely to be stretched beyond their current limits if and when the new Informatics program(s) come to fruition; the launching of Informatics will require addition faculty resources for the department; the preliminary minimum estimate is to add an additional faculty resources (i.e., a statistician and an economist). The department is already understaffed in these areas with only one full-time faculty member in each these areas is inadequate for such an expansion. The graduate program in math is beyond full capacity with over 200 graduate students and most graduate math classes fill to capacity with in the first few hours of possible enrollment. The amount of grading is especially time consuming in virtually all the department's courses.

AY2015

The departments programs have stretched to meet its goals that align well with the ESU Strategic plan and FORESIGHT 2020. Obviously these were aligned with FORESIGHT 2020 long before the newest ESU Strategic plan was considered. Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning are at the core of STEM.

The foundation of the skills reaches a critical juncture when students first matriculate in college. In spite of being understaffed for a long time, the department has attempted to continually improve its remedial and beginning courses. The department is convinced that it finally has evolved to a superior learning environment in its introductory courses.

The recent HLC self study found students critical of many aspects of ESU; however, there were no negative comments about ESU's undergraduate math or economics program and only one about the graduate program, which incidently was offset by a positive comment.

This is highly unusual as math is often the target of passionate students who struggle with its rigor.

The next step is to preserve the gains the department has achieved as it falls even further behind in faculty resources, especially in economics. In spite of this, the department is venturing into an even higher profile in the new university's Honors Program. The push will be towards even more civic engagement with emphases on math and quantitative reasoning along with leadership.

Attached Files

[Program Review Indicators - MATH and ECONOMICS 2016](#)

[Program Review Indicators - MATH and ECONOMICS 2015](#)

[Program Review Indicators - MATH and ECONOMICS 2014](#)

[MA_EC_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)

[Senior Survey Results - Mathematics and Economics - AY2017](#)

[Program Review Indicators - MATH and ECONOMICS 2017](#)

[Senior Survey Results - Mathematics and Economics - AY2018.pdf](#)

[Program Review Indicators - MATH and ECONOMICS 2018](#)

Program Name: Economics BS

Summary of Program Assessments:

*****Assessments for future years can be found in the 5-year plan*****

AY 2017

The department continues to use a variety of assessment techniques and approaches. The following are highlights from the 2016-2017 academic year from the assessment of the undergraduate economics program:

- The department conducted its periodic focus group of economics majors to review and potentially revise its student learning outcomes and goals. *(The ESU economics program is perhaps the only program in the country that has its students determine the goals and outcomes for its program. This is done without any of the economics faculty present to ensure it is driven by the students. This model has been presented and praised at an HLC assessment workshop in Chicago and in the documents submitted for CHEA assessment awards.*
- The department created an alumni survey as planned and administered it in 2017. The specific comments were the most useful; they are summarized below with the condensed question/topic in bold:
- **ESU Preparation**--All positive (except one N/A)
- **List of courses you did not encounter and would recommend** - One wished he had taken even more writing intensive courses. Another student wanted an additional linear algebra course.
- **Suggestions for improvement:** One student wanted more math electives and another hope to see growth in the (economics) program for additional peers.
- The department went through a long recruiting/screening/interviewing process and hired another economist to augment our department's only economist, Rob Catlett; Bekah Selby arrive in July 2017. This outside perspective will aid our assessment process in future years.

AY 2016

The department uses a variety of assessment techniques that provide multiple sources of information related to outcomes. These include linkage studies for the undergraduate economics program; in each they provide external direct assessment of math and quantitative reasoning skills. In addition, the linkage studies related to communication skills (i.e., English ACT and CAAP deciles) provide assessment for one of the economics program outcomes. Writing Progress Progress in Quantitative Lower than expected 0% 0% Expected progress 77% 74% Higher than expected 23% 26% The Higher than Expected Progress has declined from the previous year; however, this is mostly attributable to the ceiling effect where students in the top deciles on the ACT cannot expand the tenth decile. One individual was near the lower boundary of Expected progress for only the second time in math and quantitative reasoning. Although still above the threshold, it did not go unnoticed. Another tool the department uses is internal direct assessment of key outcomes in all programs. A good deal of the data is included in this report; some of it is in other reports and not duplicated here. 2015-2016 Δ From Previous Year Δ From Overall Mean Rating Algebra skills in Solving equilibrium 0.53 0.16 IS - LM Analysis (0.13) (0.02) AD & AS Analysis Comprehensive 0.58 0.02 2015-2016 Rating Indifference Curves & Budget Analysis 0.06 (0.04) Production and Cost Analysis 0.06 0.09 Market Structure Analysis w/ Cost & Production 0.39 0.27 The data is mixed in terms of changes from the previous year and the overall mean. The changes are relatively small, with the largest at 58 basis points (i.e., slightly larger than one-half of one percentage point) increase in Aggregate Demand and Aggregate Supply Analysis. AY 2015 The economics assessment continues to focus on the outcomes developed by student focus groups. The students in the program reach a consensus on these outcomes (i.e., the focus group leader calls them goals for clarity) without faculty input or presence. The focus group is typically led by a professional moderator or a recognized external assessment expert. Although the outcomes have remained largely intact since 2003, they have been modified slightly by each group. The focus groups typically occur every other year. The faculty finds ways to assess and measure these using external direct and indirect measures (e.g., linkage studies, feedback from employers and organizations contracting with the Center for Community Research for undergraduate economic research along with internal indirect measures). In the area of economic analysis student learning had remained relatively stable with areas of increase and with some erosion in the use of algebra skills in solving for equilibrium and using Aggregate Demand and Aggregate Supply in a comprehensive mathematical model from 3.44 to 2.75. Although part of this may be attributable to a small sample size of economics majors along a much larger proportion of non-majors and exchange students in the core class, regardless, corrective action will be taken. In addition, the use of indifference analysis diminished from 3.45 to 3.19. Although part of this can be explained by the reduction of a faculty position in economics and the subsequent sequence of courses some students are effectively forced to take, some things can be done. In an attempt to improve student learning in these areas showing some decreases, additional work will be added to aggregate demand and aggregate supply in EC 101 and EC 306 Intermediate Macroeconomics. This will come at the expense of some non linear tax functions and money demand equations. The work with indifference curves budget constraints, isoquants, and isocost is heavily dependent on when students take EC 305 Intermediate Microeconomics; when many students take EC 351 Labor Economics before EC 305, they generally do much better with this analysis. EC 351 is on an every third semester rotation while EC 305 is a fall-only course. Without additional faculty, this is almost certain to continue and variations of this magnitude are to be expected. Linkage studies continue to show all students in the economics program have individually and collectively made expected progress or more than expected progress as defined by ACT. The number and percentage of students entering the program in the upper and lower parts of the ACT spectrum represents a wide array of students. It is important to note that the economics program is one of the most diverse at ESU with 25 to 35 percent of students in each of the following categories: Hispanic

(I.e., Hispanic as noted by the US Census Bureau can be of any race), African-American (or Black), and Asian. In addition, the program has recently graduated three Native Americans. Virtually all economics students have a scholarly experience off campus through undergraduate research, internship, study abroad and/or civic engagement. In addition the program has embedded Kansas Leadership Center (KLC)-style leadership education and practice opportunities in all of its economics (EC) courses, directly aligning with Goal 2 of the strategic plan. The program is closely aligned with KBOR FORESIGHT 2020 Strategic Plan and fits nearly perfectly in ESU's The Adaptive University strategic plan. The vast majority of students eligible to work in Kansas stay or return to Kansas after graduation, if they do not immediately pursue an advanced degree. Virtually all of these students are in relatively high demand areas with STEM as an emphasis. See the supporting evidence files. Retention and graduation rates in economics have been among the highest at ESU. It is important to note that the department recognizes that students may select a major that doesn't match their expectations or career pathways, thus some change majors during the duration of their studies. Regardless of ACT scores and prior academic preparation, some students may find the rigor of the college curriculum too challenging and choose to pursue other educational venues. Thus, the criteria for success in this area depends on the individual student.

Attached Files

- [Econ Assessment 2017 Alumni Survey](#)
- [Econ assessment data Including non linkage](#)
- [Economic Analysis - Micro, Macro, Annual Cohort analysis](#)
- [Linkage - Econ Math](#)
- [Recent Econ Grads with Math Intensive Designation](#)
- [LAS-MC-ECONOMICS-BS](#)
- [General-Education-Course-Specific-Student-Learning Assessment - Economics](#)
- [First-Course&Econ Gen Ed 2016](#)
- [Econ Assessment Linkage Studies 2015-17 with Institution & historical comparisons printer friendly](#)
- [Econ Assessment Micro and Macro 2013-2016](#)

Program Name: Mathematics BS/BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

*****Assessments for future years can be found in the 5-year plan*****

AY 2017

In AY2017, the department made progress on two out of our previous three goals.

One goal was to examine the calculus sequence for possible revisions. Recommendations were made by the Calculus Committee at a Calculus Assessment Forum on March 8. Those recommendations were approved by the faculty with the understanding that the changes would be re-examined in a few years to see if the revisions were beneficial. In particular, more integration topics will be introduced in Calculus I so that parametric and polar coordinates can be introduced in Calculus II. This will allow more time to cover topics in Calculus III, which was the goal that originally spurred this initiative.

A second goal was to revise program requirements in regards to offerings in courses requiring programming skills. These changes were made.

The third goal was to examine our math ed program to make sure it aligns with the new Kansas licensure standards. Those standards were just released in April so that goal has been moved to AY2018.

During the past year, the department collected data via an alumni survey (32 responses from alumni graduating in the past 10 years) and three graduating senior focus group discussions (21 students). Results were generally quite positive. Students were asked to grade the department in regards to the quality of their education. The overall "GPA" given to the department by seniors was 3.8. Alumni from the 2010s assigned a GPA of 3.9 and those from the 2000s gave a 3.7. Alumni felt prepared for graduate work and teaching. They also believe a strength of the program is the approachableness of the faculty. One recurring concern was the programming requirement for math ed majors. Seniors echoed these comments.

The faculty also held a forum on April 26 to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the program. Potential future steps were identified:

- Explore new undergraduate concentrations and synergies.
- Create a scholarship program to attract additional strong mathematics majors
- Re-examine programming and tech opportunities for majors.
- Explore additional co-curricular activities.

Based on these recommendations, the Undergraduate Committee will set a more specific direction in Fall 2017.

[This does not include Connie's KSDE assessment report that will be written later this summer.]

AY 2016

Like in previous years the undergraduate programs in mathematics (i.e., BA, BS, BSE math) have the majority of students in math-related teacher education programs. The accreditation process of organizations like the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) form a generous share of the assessment because these students generally take common mathematics courses. The evidence illustrates that 100 percent of ESU students pass all of their math-related Praxis exams.

As was noted previously, the math program assesses the student's ability to create proofs, which are a foundation of collegiate mathematics beyond calculus III. The first comprehensive assessment of these is done in Discrete Math. Similar in comparison with previous years, indirect proofs generally have been more challenging for math students in comparison with "direct" or "induction" proofs. The most recent data illustrates this. Although the means from AY 2016 are somewhat lower than the historical means as illustrated below, the variation in direct and induction proofs is worth noting.

Fall 2015	Overall Mean	Rating
3.36	3.49	Direct Proof
2.14	2.39	Indirect Proof
2.86	3.35	Induction Proof

Spring 2016	Overall Mean	Rating
2.42	3.49	Direct Proof
2.17	2.39	Indirect Proof
3.26	3.35	Induction Proof

Part of this may be attributable to missing data from the Fall 2014 semester since some seasonality was noted by the focus group. In addition, different professors use different techniques.

Additional emphasis on proofs is found in MA322 Linear Algebra, MA425 Abstract Algebra, and MA 735 Advanced Calc I should help math majors. The focus group noted that students in Abstract Algebra in the previous two semesters have been reasonably well prepared for proofs. Ideally, individual student learning would be assessed in uniformly in Abstract Algebra with Discrete providing the pre-test-like set of observations and Abstract Algebra providing the post-test-like set of observations. A couple of challenges are worth noting here. Students do not follow the same path between these two points and the time elapsed between the two can differ considerably. In addition, students are not in perfect cohorts. Regardless, this information is useful in closing the loop; in this case the evidence does not indicate a need for any program changes to improve student learning related to proofs.

The curriculum committee will be considering alternatives for the current edition of the calculus text. The gateway exams provide some indicators that may be useful. This loop is closed every several years as the committee routinely considers these adoptions.

The linkage studies, which are shown in more detail in the evidence, show that 98.68 percent of students who have officially declared a major in an undergraduate math program (i.e., BA, BS, BSE math) made expected progress or more in student learning as defined by ACT's detailed decile analysis. It is important to note the ceiling effects; the largest number of students by far is in the tenth decile on both the ACT and CAAP exams; these students are precluded from showing "More than Expected Progress" as defined by ACT because of the ceiling effect.

Teacher Work Sample data indicates that the means declined slightly; however, all students were above the threshold.

TWS Secondary 2014-5	TWS Secondary 2015-6
132.5	129.0
TWS Middle School 2014-5	TWS Middle School 2015-6
127.75	125.33

The percentage decreases are roughly 2.6 percent and variations like these are expected and do not indicate changes in the program are

necessary, especially since all of the students were above the threshold.

Although a good deal of the assessment of the undergraduate programs in mathematics is covered by externally driven reports (e.g., NCATE, and KSDE), this summary indicates additional assessment tools are used here to ensure the outcomes of the programs are adequately covered and meaningful.

AY 2015

The undergraduate programs in mathematics (i.e., BA, BS, BSE math) have the majority of students in math-related teacher education programs. The accreditation process of organizations like the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) form a generous share of the assessment because these students generally take common mathematics courses. The evidence illustrates that 100 percent of ESU students pass all of their math-related Praxis exams.

In addition, the department has begun using linkage studies for undergraduate math majors; this unquestionably ensures alignment with FORESIGHT 2020 and the ESU Strategic Plan as an adaptive university. The linkage studies, which are shown in more detail in the evidence, show that 98.7 percent of students who have officially declared a major in an undergraduate math program (i.e., BA, BS, BSE math) made expected progress or more in student learning as defined by ACT's detailed decile analysis. The one student who made less than expected progress transferred to ESU from Highland Community College and did not pass any ESU math courses; the student changed his major to psychology. Other than that, it is interesting to observe that the lowest decile achieved on the CAAP was the fifth. All four of the students except one in the fifth decile either transferred to ESU with math elsewhere or began in the lowest remedial math course at the time (i.e., MA095). All three of these students combined only passed two ESU collegiate-level math courses. The other student in this category recently graduated and is a math teacher in Johnson County. She "did not test well" and had the highest Teacher Work Sample (TWS) of all math students. Hard work seems to make a difference and it is interesting to observe the significant improvement (i.e., rightward drift) in the linkage study. It shows that significant student learning in mathematics relative to a national sample.

The math program assesses the student's ability to create proofs, which are a foundation of collegiate mathematics beyond calculus III.

Indirect proofs generally have been more challenging for math students in comparison with "direct" or "induction" proofs. Part of this may be attributable to the transition from computational intensive courses like the beginning calculus courses. Additional emphasis on proofs in MA322 Linear Algebra, MA425 Abstract Algebra, and MA 735 Advanced Calc I should help math majors.

The math program has relatively high retention rates at ESU and part of this is attributable to small class sizes in comparison with larger universities. Virtually all courses, and especially those beyond MA110 College Algebra are taught by the faculty.

Attached Files

- [Exit interviews Spring 2017](#)
- [Exit interview summary Math Ed FS16](#)
- [2017 alumni since 2007 survey results](#)
- [Math Undergraduate Assessment Forum 4-26-2017](#)
- [Math Undergrad Linkage](#)
- [Math Undergrad Proofs](#)
- [Praxis Math Content](#)
- [Praxis Math MSM](#)
- [Retention Rates Math](#)
- [Teacher Work Sample \(TWS\) Undergrad Math](#)
- [LAS-MC-MATHEMATICS-BS-BSE](#)
- [General-Education-Course-Specific-Student-Learning Assessment - Math](#)
- [September 2016 Math Assessment Report - 5-5-2016](#)
- [September 2015 Math Assessment Report for KBOR - Wells](#)
- [Math Proofs Undergrad 240 Analysis](#)
- [Mathematics Education DATA 14-16](#)
- [Math Undergraduate Assessment Forum 10-22-2015](#)
- [Math Assessment Linkage Studies 2010-6 printer friendly w-captions Pre](#)
- [Orals - Thesis defense Assessment and other grad assessment Aug 2014-Sept 2016](#)
- [Assessment 1a b Secondary Data Tables for Praxis Content](#)
- [Assessment 1c d Secondary Data Tables for Praxis PLC](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table for TWS Factors 1-4 and KPTC 1 2 secondary](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table for Secondary Clinical Experiences](#)

- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Assessment 4 Secondary Data Table for TWS Factors 5-7 and KPTP](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table for Secondary Course Grades](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide for Course Grades](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table for Secondary Portfolio](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table for Middle Level Mathematics TWS 1-4 and KPTP 1-2 - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 1 c d middle level data tables - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 1a b Middle Level Data Tables for Praxis Content - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table for Middle Level Clinical Experiences - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table for Middle Level TWS Factors 5-7 and KPTP - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table for Middle level Course Grades - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Course Name and Number Middle Level Mathematics.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide for Course Grades.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table for Middle Level Portfolio.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Portfolio Rubric.docx](#)
- [BSE Secondary Middle Schl Math Program of Study.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Math 5-8 Report.docx](#)

Program Name: Mathematics MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

*****Assessments for future years can be found in the 5-year plan*****

AY 2017

On April 19, 2017, we held a faculty forum to discuss strengths, weaknesses, and goals in our graduate programs. We identified key areas to be addressed in the coming year, including changes to the enrollment procedures, increasing oral seminar attendance, and continuing to improve the quality of oral seminars.

At the end of the Spring 2017 semester, we implemented a program-wide survey to gather feedback from our graduate students. The results of this survey will help with scheduling classes, tracking progress toward graduation, getting feedback on proposed enrollment changes, and understanding our students' goals in the program. For our incoming students, we also gather information about their mathematical backgrounds. Similar surveys will be conducted at the end of each Fall and Spring semester. From this survey, we found that 81% of survey takers are positive or neutral towards the proposed enrollment changes. Out of 65 students, the mean response to "Rate your satisfaction with our program" was 8.54 out of 10, with a median of 9.

We have continued to collect data on comprehensive exams. Each attempted exam is recorded as pass, weak pass, or fail, and whether or not the attempt is a retake of a previous exam. The student pass rate for comprehensive exams has remained steady. In AY2016, the pass rate was 86.6% (71/82) and in AY2017 it was 86.2% (75/87). Toward the issue of academic dishonesty, many professors are requiring students to take exams at testing centers. Faculty now share information about all instances of academic dishonesty by recording each case in a shared spreadsheet. Of our incoming students, we learned that 59% have taken a proof-based course in the last five years, 27% have taken a proof-based course more than five years ago, and 14% have never taken a proof-based course.

To help increase attendance to oral seminars, the times are being shared on the Math Department Graduate Student course on Canvas. Some faculty are experimenting with requiring students enrolled in MA810 to attend or review a minimum number of oral seminars. This both encourages attendance and provides students with examples of how an oral seminar talk should be structured.

AY 2016

The growth in the MS in math program has exacerbated the challenges of inadequate faculty resources to keep up with the demand. Although a new faculty member in math was added last year, the courses in the master's program continue to reach their maximum capacity with hours of when enrollment begins.

As was noted last year, the time-intensive grading process of mathematical proofs is a limiting factor in enrollment. The department

appreciates the recognition of the need for resources in the feedback related to last year's report.

Along with assessment-driven modifications in the way the final oral presentations are done, student learning in the program continues to improve. The file uploader in the Campus Labs software indicated success in uploading files; however, they appear to be hidden, so some of the data is illustrated below and also uploaded in the undergraduate section as a backup.

Final Oral (or Thesis Defense) MS in Mathematics								
Historical Rankings					2015-2016 Rankings			
Ratings (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Communication (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Concepts (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Mechanics (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Problem Solving (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Communication (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Concepts (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Mechanics (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)	Problem Solving (4 = Excellent, 3 = Very Good, 2 = Good, 1 = Fair)
Mean	3.104	2.830	2.756	3.075	3.238	3.000	2.900	3.167
Standard Error	0.166	0.159	0.177	0.180	0.257	0.241	0.280	0.294
Median	4.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	4.000	3.000	3.000	4.000
Mode	4.000	3.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.000	4.000	4.000
Standard Deviation	1.153	1.090	1.190	1.141	1.179	1.076	1.252	1.249
Sample Variance	1.329	1.188	1.416	1.302	1.390	1.158	1.568	1.559
Range	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4
Minimum	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Maximum	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Sum	149	133	124	123	68	60	58	57
n	48	47	45	40	21	20	20	18

The data reveal slightly larger mean scores on the final orals. The standard deviation in increased somewhat in both mechanics and problem solving. These presentations often take considerable preparation (e.g., months) and the presentations range from 30 to 45 minutes. They are at or near the end of the student's graduate program. They can take considerable faculty mentoring.

One of the challenges in a larger program is academic dishonesty. The department has approached this with additional questions on the course feedback (i.e., commonly called student evaluations). The closing of the loop is expected in 2016-2017 academic year.

AY 2015

The MS program in math has grown dramatically. The faculty are determined to ensure the program that is delivered to distant students is comparable to the on-campus experience. Most of the direct assessment of student learning compares on-campus students with distant students. The standard deviation is generally higher among the distant students, while the mean and other data suggests these groups are comparable. The evidence suggests that student learning of "mechanics" has recently improved (3.08 to 3.40) while "problem solving" and "communication" have diminished from 2014 to 2015 (3.0 to 2.8 and 3.15 to 2.83 respectively). The standard deviation grew from 0.55 to .75 in communication and diminished in problem solving and mechanics from 0.82 to 0.45 and .095 to .55 respectively; this suggests mixed results that are more easily discernible in the evidence. The department's Annual Assessment Forum effectively touches on these in course offerings and infrastructure. See the goal: *Explore alternative web-based systems for oral presentations* the Assessment Forum.

The greatest challenge is assimilating students in this high demand field. Larger class sizes are counter-productive in this area because of the heavy emphasis on proofs. These are not easily graded, especially since a myriad of approaches may be used in the development of a proof.

It takes considerable time and effort on the part of the faculty member to range and guide the student's work.

Attached Files

- [Grad Assessment Forum \(4-19-17\)](#)
- [Comp Exams and the results no names](#)
- [Graduate Student Survey \(Spring 2017\) no names](#)
- [LAS-MC-MATHEMATICS-MS](#)
- [Assessment Forum MS Math](#)
- [Assessment Written Comps MS Math](#)
- [Extensive Assessment Spreadsheet MS Math](#)
- [Grad Math Stat analysis](#)
- [Math Grad Analysis](#)
- [MS Orals Summary Statistics and raw data](#)
- [Orals - Thesis defense Assessment Aug 2014-Sept 2016](#)
- [Oral interview summary.xlsx](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

Your initial department level assessment plan was well thought out and provided some succinct direction in how you approached the assessment of your major programs. The use of student feedback and the faculty gathering in a forum setting to identify strategies and ways to improve student learning is a great way to navigating change in an inclusive manner. Working together as a team to strengthen the curriculum and implement change strategies is a best practice. You have made good progress in advancing the development of the Quantitative Economics concentration in Informatics. With the syllabi developed, it may be helpful to design your assessment plan for the concentration as a part of the process. For example, develop a cycle of assessment for the courses in the concentration (if they are not already a part of a major program of study assessment plan. The implementation of the 5-Year assessment plan is underway, keep up the momentum on this cycled plan. The end result should provide some key information in your decisions and direction for improving the student learning experience from great to even greater! Your change strategies (including the pre-recording of live lectures) create a more interactive learning environment (nice). Tracking the success of the change strategies implemented for the calculus sequence and the changes made in the MA130 course should provide term-to-term data. It may be beneficial to identify a few specific assessments to measure the effectiveness of your changes (say, in a few terms). With the speed of the change in technology and pedagogy, waiting for years to conclude if the changes were effective may be counterproductive.

For the Economics BS program (5-year cycle) assessments, it appears the EC499 Capstone course is being assessed annually. You may want to present these annual findings in the first section (labeled years 1-4 of the cycle) instead in the year 2 section. This way, you have a continuous dialogue of how students are achieving in the capstone experience for each year of the 4-years. The learning experiences described in your assessments are awesome! Students retain what they have learned better if you engage them in all three types of learning, cognitive, affective, and psychomotor; all of which are described in your community and civic engagement projects. It sounds like the challenge of the day is bridging the gap between student performance in calculus courses and the learning experiences in economics courses. If there is a way to bring some of the high impact learning to bridge the mathematics functions of the learning to a real-life experience, you may have better symmetry across both the economics and mathematics learning contexts. This would require additional time commitments from the faculty involved, but if we can get our students motivated in their learning experiences everyone is more satisfied in their learning and instructing. I mention this potential strategy as you mention the calculus sequence as a focus of your assessment plans for both Economics BS and Math BS/BS/BSE.

In the Mathematics program (BS/BA/BSE and MS) faculty participation in the assessment of their courses was good. I can sense that there is some frustration with student learning efforts. I think that this frustration can be felt in many disciplines, especially those requiring time, repetition, and focus in order to learn appropriately. It is a given that students lack of motivation is not a reflection on the faculty's ability to teach, but rather a situation that we are all always trying to navigate. Key areas to focus change strategies are in keeping the curriculum current and applying those newest technologies in the teaching practices. Students are using technology as a learning tool more so than ever before, so our abilities to integrate the use of technologies into the learning process can keep students engaged. A great example is your use of the lightboard and the popularity of the tool with students. I believe that your continuous dialogue with students in focus groups and exit interviews will continue to inform some of the changes that are beneficial to improving student learning. If your faculty can focus on tweaking and changing those things they have control over, there will be more satisfaction. We shouldn't feel like we have to defend students lack of success based on whether or not they are trying. Focus on making the learning experience for those who are working hard and trying into the best experience it can be. This is the truly satisfying part of our teaching experiences.

Finally, the assessment work and contributions of the department's faculty on behalf of the general education program assessment is greatly appreciated. The foundations learning of mathematics and economics content knowledge along with critical thinking, teamwork, volunteerism, and civic engagement, goes really far in evidencing the quality instruction of the department faculty. Navigating change and using assessment as a tool is a challenge in all programs. The faculty have engaged in the course embedded assessment reporting and I am seeing some good change strategies emerging. It is also evident that the department is taking into account the student perspectives of their learning experiences and taking to heart some of their requests for change as well. Keep up the good work and remain encouraged even in those times when it is hard. It is obvious that the faculty are working hard on their assessment practices!

Academic Year 2017

It is evident that the Mathematics and Economics department has been assessing all of its programs and spends adequate time surveying its students and graduates to identify strengths and weaknesses. The department set out with a very succinct plan for assessing and gathering information from students and alumni at the beginning of the year and all of these plans were followed through on. Nice work! The efforts of the faculty in assessing those math and economics courses that are a part of the general education program are greatly appreciated. Because of this commitment we have made great strides in our general education assessment practices. The contributions of key members of the faculty in lending expertise to the General Education Assessment Team and the assessment of the College Algebra with Review courses is greatly appreciated as well. The growth of the Mathematics MS program is a great indicator of the departments commitment to integrating mathematics into an online delivery format and adapting to the high level of demand, yet keeping the program at the utmost of quality. The use of the "lightboard" and the quality of the online mathematics program is the direct result of the commitment of the faculty in doing this right. Kudos to the faculty! Another strength of the faculty is the commitment to the focus groups and forums where you engage in dialogue about implementing changes that positively impact the student learning experiences. The feedback your students provide as a part of your indirect assessments was very informative and you have made some nice adjustments based on this assessment data. You have done well to continue assessment of the Economics program although you have been short a faculty member. The efforts expended in the assessment of the economics program are providing some good information to keep the program current and popular with the students. It is fortunate that an additional faculty member has been added and that should provide some flexibility in implementing the 5-year program assessment cycle plan for the Economics program. At your earliest convenience, please identify the economics courses for the assessments in years two through four of the 5-year plan. You may have to prioritize those courses that you really want to assess the effectiveness of first, as it may be challenging to assess all courses in the curriculum in years two - four in the cycle. You may want to look at student success metrics for the courses in the curriculum and determine where you can make the most progress in improving the learning experience. The mathematics BS/BSE program can benefit from the 5-year assessment of the curriculum. The KSDE mandated assessments will provide an effective assessment strategy and identifies a few specific courses for assessing student success metrics. Those courses not assessed as a part of the KSDE reporting structure can be assessed across years two through four as a part of the 5-year assessment cycle. Adding in some course embedded assessment practices to the capstone and thesis assessments for the Masters program should provide some valuable information for improving the student learning experience, as well. You have done an excellent job of setting up the course sequences in the 5-Year Program Review Assessment Cycles for the mathematics programs. In the past three years, the department has gained a lot of momentum in assessing the quality of student learning in its programs. Keep up the great work and commitment to assessment practices!

Academic Year 2016

The department has been focusing assessment efforts on multiple fronts and it was encouraging to see the addition of the master's level assessments using the thesis projects defense scored by using rubrics. Specifically, the comments used when determining the rating score was a nice addition to provide some depth to the scoring decisions. I did notice that when comparing means for each of the dimensions (communication, concepts, mechanics, and problem solving) of the historical rankings to those of the 2015-2016 rankings showed a decrease in all four areas. It may be beneficial to disaggregate the data by online versus face-to-face instruction delivery type. Taking a deeper look could provide some information on changes you may deem beneficial for either of the delivery types. You will want to keep an eye on this trend and if it becomes evident that the trends are continuing (means declining from historical rankings) to show a decrease in means across all of the dimensions there may be a need to focus improvement strategies. If the trend appears to become more profound in any particular dimension you may want to look at the courses that contribute to learning for the dimension. Discoveries of this type can lead to subsequent year assessments looking at a specific course or clusters of courses. Use your curriculum maps to identify which courses are contributing to specific program level student learning outcomes. To keep it manageable and relevant to faculty numbers, you may decide to focus on only a couple of courses per year. Always keep the workload manageable, otherwise the work becomes overbearing.

The predicament for students majoring in economics and the course frequency and sequencing appears to be a continuous issue as this was mentioned in last year's report as well. There's no quick and easy fix for this problem. You may want to consider getting some student opinion on how they would make change. There may be some adjustments that can be done through consulting the departments' curriculum committee. In next year's report, if available give some specific details to some of the changes that you mention are going to be made.

Thanks for sharing strategies on placing more emphasis on aggregate demand and supply, thus reducing emphasis on non-linear tax

functions and money demand equations. This is the level of detail that explains the changes driven through assessment practices. It is recognized that the decision to rescind the graduation competency requirement will have a profound negative impact on the sustainability of the ACT-CAAP linkage studies which have served the department well for evidencing 'value added' student learning for both mathematical and quantitative reasoning and written communication skills. An option to consider would be to use the AAC&U value rubrics to score course embedded assignments giving the faculty control of the curriculum being assessed, meanwhile using an externally designed instrument to norm student work over multiple courses. If you are interested, we could have a conversation about how this assessment process could work for the department. It may be interesting to know that in a six-year trend analysis completed last spring 2016, the data showed that for the ESU fall 2015 cohort, 42% of incoming freshmen students were transferring in an average of 14 credit hours. These were credit hours completed prior to graduating from high school (dual credit/articulated courses). This creates a variable that can't be accounted for in the ACT-CAAP linkage studies, which is where a student actually receives the education. Of the courses transferred in, the top two most frequently transferred in courses were composition and written communication and mathematics and statistics. So, this may further substantiate movement to a different assessment strategy.

In regard to the mathematics BA/BSE program, the KSDE assessment data and reports are due next in October 2017, so if there is assessment data being collected on an annual basis feel free to upload data files. The KSDE report can be uploaded with comments from section V when the report becomes available a year from now. Also, as noted in the assessment report there is some variability in mean scores on student learning for the three specific types of proofs and this being the foundation for success in subsequent mathematics courses. The situation you present for controlling when students take courses (time in between courses) and to identify distinct cohorts (no change for longitudinal comparisons) does make pre-and post-test assessments difficult and sometimes misinforming. If you can't control the intervention, then it is not practical to depend on the information to make curricular decisions. However, it may be beneficial to do pre-and post-testing within each of the courses (Abstract and Discrete), instead of across the two courses. The benefit of doing this will inform the faculty member of where students are at in relation to prior mathematics knowledge, and there is the value added component from the pre-post test assessments. In doing so, it will be important to have a common instrument used for both pre- and post-testing.

On general topics, you may find it beneficial to delay assessment efforts for the informatics degree until there is certainty that the program will be positioned within the department. In next years report, it would be beneficial to include some specific examples of decisions that come from the curriculum committee (evidences a culture of continuous quality improvement). In addition, the faculty focus group is a really great way to include all faculty in processes to improve student learning, it would be great to have some specific information on these changes. You have done some really good assessment work and collected good data, the piece that would enhance and give more credit to the department would be some more specifics on change strategies (closing the loop). If you need assistance in setting up assessments or want to visit about any of this feedback, please reach out to me. The retention for the mathematics and economics degree programs is outstanding (5-year trend average 1st to 2nd year retention is 84%) which is a direct indicator that the department is doing things right! Kudos, and keep up the great assessment work!

Academic Year 2015

The assessment plan for the department is comprehensive in such that it aligns with departmental goals, the university's strategic plan, and the Kansas Board of Regents strategic plan. The KBOR Foresight 2020 strategic plan stipulates that Mathematics and Quantitative and Analytical reasoning skills are highly valued and that ESU graduates should have mastery to some degree upon graduation. Using ACT/CAAP linkage studies data (Economics and Mathematics majors) as the external direct instrument is good and the results show that the vast majority of these students are effectively making progress in learning these core skills. For the past three years, the Institutional Research and Assessment Office has been purchasing from ACT, Inc. the ACT/CAAP linkage studies (disaggregated at the Quartile levels) for all students who began their studies at ESU. We will continue to do so, as this evidence is used in support of general education assessments. I have attached three files in the folder below for your information. It may bring some comparative depth into your data as it includes all students who began as First-Time Freshmen at ESU, so most will have taken courses in the mathematics and economics curriculum (General Education Courses). These reports include students majoring in a variety of disciplines. Your annual Economic Analysis data for both Micro and Macro learning outcomes is a nice evidence piece. It is hoped that the faculty position can be restored, and you are right about the sample size being a mitigating factor in making generalizations. You may want to keep an eye on this for another year to see if the same performance trends continue. During this three-year trend mean scores have went up slightly, then down slightly, so before you make any drastic changes let the trends normalize for another year. At face value, it does appear that this may be affecting performance and can also affect time to completion, if students wait for the third semester rotation sequence to come around in order to improve their preparedness by taking EC 351 prior to taking EC 305. Depending on whether or not the faculty replacement occurs, this may be an opportunity to make some changes to the curriculum at the course level. Changing the curriculum or adjusting course sequencing is time intensive and requires much thought, so my suggestion is to just give it some time and confirm the trend. It may end up being a non-factor if the faculty position is restored. The Mathematics BA/BS/BSE programs will for the most part be directed by the Kansas Department of Education through its learning standards requirements. Changes to these programs are informed by achievements of candidates on Praxis - principles of teaching and content knowledge tests. I noticed that the Middle School Math Praxis scores had drifted downward. It may be

beneficial to gather some information on those sub-components where students aren't scoring as highly and determine what can be done to improve learning in these areas. I've known some faculty to take the tests to determine what is covered in the content, so they can adapt their courses accordingly. The Mathematics MS program has changed in the last couple of years, specifically placing the program online causing a big spike in enrollment. It will be important to confirm that the quality of the program remains intact as changing from face-to-face to online can adversely affect program integrity due to the change in the learning environment. The data to date confirms that the transition was beneficial and that no ill effects have occurred. It will be important to maintain a thorough look at this program to confirm student learning success over time. The general education part of the department has made some positive changes in the past few years and the data supports the improvement in student learning. The addition of the lab section to the college algebra course was genius. It is encouraging that math faculty continue to work with graduate teaching assistants to improve their teaching knowledge and expertise. Data supporting the development of mathematical, quantitative and analytical reasoning skills is reported to the Kansas Board of Regents and supports the department's dedication to students mastering these core skills. One suggestion I have is to provide some more details in the strengths and weaknesses section of the annual assessment forum report, specifically the weaknesses section where it is stated that a weakness was fixed. Providing more details of what these changes were and how it was anticipated these changes would impact students strengthens your position on continuous quality improvements. Overall, the assessment program is comprehensive, keep up the quality work!

Attached Files

- [2015_Student_Learning_Assessment_Report_KBOR_Mathematics_and_Analytical_Reasoning](#)
- [CAAP-ACT Linkage Studies for AY2008-AY2012 Baseline Data](#)
- [CAAP-ACT Linkage Studies for AY2013 Data](#)
- [CAAP-ACT Linkage Studies for AY2014 Data](#)
- [Mathematics & Economics Meta Rubric Results 2015](#)
- [Senior Survey Results for Mathematics and Economics Grads for AY 2016](#)
- [College Algebra mapping to GE Goal 1 and 4 - Wells 9-8-2016](#)
- [September 2016 Math Assessment Report - 5-5-2016](#)
- [General Education Course Embedded Assessment Report - Math and Econ 2016](#)

Providing Department: Mathematics and Economics

Responsible Roles:

Betsy Yanik (E10000039), Connie Schrock (E10087923), Brian Hollenbeck (E10087863), Tom Mahoney (E11091566), Rob Catlett (E10000227)

PROGRAM LEVEL 5-YEAR ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Economics BS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

ECONOMICS

AY 2018

- As it has done each year, the department conducted its periodic focus group of economics majors to review and potentially revise its student learning outcomes and goals. The AY 2017-2018 was slated for review. The goals and outcomes are not revised annually because that is arguably too frequent. *(The ESU undergraduate economics program is perhaps the only program in the country that has its students determine the goals and outcomes for its program. This is done without any of the economics faculty present to ensure it is driven by the students. This model has been presented and praised at an HLC assessment workshop in Chicago and in the documents submitted for CHEA assessment awards.)*
- The department conducted focus group-type exit interviews of its graduating seniors; this included economics, math, math-ed and the graduate program in math. The findings related to economics found the median and average grades the economics students ascribed to the economics program were in the A range.
- They specifically highlighted civic engagement as a favorite. Moreover, they universally found their communication skills improved dramatically based on presentations in their economics classes and to external constituents. They strongly encouraged us to avoid cutting back on either civic engagement or presentations. They were somewhat less enthusiastic about mathematics; they seemed to prefer applied math, which might be read as having the perspective to understand how math can be used helps.

AY 2017

The department continues to use a variety of assessment techniques and approaches. The following are highlights from the 2016-2017 academic year from the assessment of the undergraduate economics program:

- The department conducted its periodic focus group of economics majors to review and potentially revise its student learning outcomes and goals. *(The ESU economics program is perhaps the only program in the country that has its students determine the goals and outcomes for its program. This is done without any of the economics faculty present to ensure it is driven by the students. This model has been presented and praised at an HLC assessment workshop in Chicago and in the documents submitted for CHEA assessment awards.*
-
- The department created an alumni survey as planned and administered it in 2017. The specific comments were the most useful; they are summarized below with the condensed question/topic in bold:
-
- **ESU Preparation**--All positive (except one N/A)
- **List of courses you did not encounter and would recommend** - One wished he had taken even more writing intensive courses. Another student wanted an additional linear algebra course.
- **Suggestions for improvement:** One student wanted more math electives and another hope to see growth in the (economics) program for additional peers.
- Linkage Studies continue to indicate improvement in student learning. Using the decile criteria established by ACT, 74 percent of economics majors demonstrated expected progress in student learning and 26 percent demonstrated more than expected progress through May 2017. The ceiling effects may appear to make the relative performance of economics majors appear to deteriorate over time; however, this is attributable to students in the highest echelons of both the ACT and CAAP deciles (e.g., students cannot increase their decile ranking on the CAAP beyond the tenth decile, which indicates the top ten percent of four-year college and university students in the United States). So, when students come to ESU already in the top ten percent nationally on the ACT, it is impossible to go beyond the top ten percent nationally on the CAAP.
- The department went through a long recruiting/screening/interviewing process and hired another economist to augment our department's only economist, Rob Catlett; Bekah Selby arrive in July 2017. This outside perspective will aid our assessment process in future years.

This is a summary of information reported elsewhere in CampusLabs.

Although the CAAP requirement for almost all economics majors has been removed by the university, the linkage studies still have some residual information. Although the most recent 2017 Linkage Study may appear to indicate diminished student learning in comparison with previous Linkage Studies in the areas of mathematical and quantitative student learning, all of that is attributable to ceiling effects (i.e., students scoring in the tenth decile on the ACT and staying in the tenth decile on the CAAP cannot demonstrate improvement beyond being in the top 10 percent in the US on each assessment).

Attached Files

- [Econ Assessment Linkage Studies 2015-17 through May 2017 with Institution & historical comparisons printer friendly](#)
- [Econ Assessment 2017 Alumni Survey](#)
- [LAS-MC-ECONOMICS-BS](#)
- [Econ Exit Interview Spring18.docx](#)
- [Fall 2017 Exit Interview with DW.docx](#)
- [Catlett-Rob-EC101-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Selby-Bekah-EC101-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Calculus - Conveniently, this course is being assessed for the mathematics BS/BSE in the same year; this is why it was selected for Year Two in this cycle. The scope of calculus used in economics is much narrower in scope than is required for a mathematics major; therefore, our assessment will focus on selected parts of the mathematics assessment (i.e., derivatives).

Basic Economics - This is the beginning course recommended for economics majors based on previous assessment. It is a foundation course upon which other economics courses build; however, many economics majors have not solidified their choice of a major before beginning EC101.

The ongoing plan is to evaluate courses that were mapped as part of the economics program. Since this is a long-term and rolling project it seemed to make sense to evaluate courses in some kind of progression. We elected to begin in roughly sequential order of course numbers along with the annual assessment of EC 499 Economics Capstone. The 100-level courses are evaluated first (e.g., EC

101 basic Economics, calculus). Fortunately, this year the evaluation of General Education courses coincides with economics program assessment. Most of the information from the evaluation of EC 101 Basic Economics is common to both.

- This plan was to evaluate 100-level courses for the AY 2017-2018.
 - EC 101 Basic Economics
 - EC 102 Honors Economics
 - Calculus
 - EC 499 Economics Capstone
- EC 101 Basic Economics
 - Throughout the years, EC 101 Basic Economics has been the gateway to the economics program. Alternatives exist (BC 103 Principles of Economics I -*macroeconomics* and *Principles of Economics II*); however, relatively few students arrive via this path and some of them struggle in EC courses. Students who take EC 101 have extremely high retention, persistence, and graduation rates in the Bachelor of Science with a major in economics. Based on previous assessment, we sometimes encourage students to take EC 101 even if they have had BC 103 or BC 104; all of these students have progress in the program.
 - The specific and detailed course assessments for EC 101 are included in the data files below. It is important to note that there is considerable overlap in the General Education and at least two of undergraduate economics program outcomes. Moreover, previous EC 101 course assessments for the General Education program illustrate a remarkably consistent pattern. Specifically, skills in quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and communication are important. They are mutually interdependent to some degree, especially quantitative reasoning and critical thinking. Mathematical erudition involves organization, *especially of the mind*, along with discipline and *mental* exercise.
- Calculus
- The specific calculus assessment is in the data files below and for this purpose we focused on MA 161 Calculus I. Additionally, the cross-fertilization of mathematics and economics will be mentioned below since it may not be fully revealed in the detailed course-specific assessments in the data files.
- An growing and impressive percentage of students in EC 101 have already taken calculus or are taking it concurrently. Surprisingly, when the professor(s) use calculus-related content and terminology the students typically assimilate it quickly and perform at a relatively high level on exams. Some students comment that economics make math more understandable, while some others start to gain perspective in math in economics. Although this synergy is interesting and the complementarities seem to naturally exist, controlling the sequence of course progression is contraindicated, especially since it might unnecessarily delay graduation.
- Generations have found calculus to range somewhere between terrifying and exciting. Moreover, some assessments of calculus going back to the early 1970's at other universities (e.g., the University of Nebraska study focused on why so many students fail calculus) have found that time on task seems to matter. Missing class and/or assignments makes a difference. Seldom are lazy students highly successful in calculus. The most recent assessment of calculus hints at this in the AY 2017-2018. It is too early to assess the implications; however, it would be interesting to test the implicit hypotheses after these students progress. It is important to recognize the implications of selection bias because some of these students might never progress to economics, while those who have more perspective and drive might.
- EC 102 Honors Economics
 - The vast majority of students with a major in economics majors take EC 102 Honors Economics, it follows the Honors College requirements and has a heavy emphasis on civic engagement. The exit interviews of graduating seniors in economics (mentioned above) indicated civic engagement was among their favorite aspects of the program. The specific evaluation of EC 102 Honors Economics is in the data files below. All indications suggest this course is highly effective and a reason economics majors self-describe themselves as an inclusive and cohesive group. It may be important to note that economics graduates are the most diverse at ESU.
- EC 499 Economics Capstone
 - As has been the norm, EC 499 Economics Capstone is a spring-semester course since we aspire to have it be as near as possible to the graduating student's final semester; spring is typically the largest graduation for economics students.
 - Students design and engage in an undergraduate research/creative project relating economics to a significant civic engagement project.
 - Apply at least one of the key concepts or principles of economics in the implementation or improvement of a civic engagement project
 - Communicate the findings of the research/creative project to external audiences (e.g., community, officials, other scholars not connected with this course) in a scholarly/professional manner.
 - Moreover, leadership based on the Kansas Leadership Center's (KLC) principles and competencies is incorporated as a special feature of the course.
 - The AY 2017-2018 capstone experience encourages graduating seniors to work with students enrolled in EC 102 Honors Economics (mentioned above) on civic engagement projects. The spring semester was jump-started by previous civic engagement work that evolved from EC 102 Honors Economics in the fall related to community gardens. It involved Jim Witt, who was the Assistant City Manager for the City of Emporia. This was

helpful as the capstone students along with their professors initiated a venture that had been in the works for the better part of a year called Corky's Vineyard. It is important to note that **this is not for public dissemination due to the commercial and competitive consequences for ESU. Steve Lovett and his students are the ones who were the driving force behind the concept.** Professor Lovett was involved in what should probably be called an external audience in this case (e.g., community, officials, other scholars not connected with this course).

- The students learned that Kansas was either the top or second leading grape-producing state in the years before the Great Depression; the historical consequences of that era dramatically changed grape production. The important take-away is the climate, soil conditions, and the like suggest vineyards have physical potential. Economic potential is another question; however, the answer is effectively the same because the market for grapes is in the structure of monopolistic competition that is a key element in microeconomics.
- The students did their research, went on field trips, consulted with experts, and started a small scale vineyard. The initial monetary expense in the hundreds of dollars was not an obstacle. Moreover, their civic engagement and leadership experience was easily observed as they elicited partners with professional planting experience in the project.
- Perhaps the most revealing assessment comes from two sources:
 - The exit interview focus group of economics citing this type of civic engagement as a favorite element of the economics program
 - Students from EC 499 Economics Capstone and EC 102 Honors Economics showing sustained interest in the project long after the semester concluded.
- Real-world civic engagement projects are risky. They cannot be controlled like a regular classroom. We recognize this risk and are fortunate that it has not had significant adverse outcomes **yet**.

Attached Files

[Akera-Adelaide-MA161-SP18.pdf](#)

[Akera-Adelaide-MA161-FA17.pdf](#)

[Selby-Bekah-EC101-SP18.pdf](#)

[Shi-Qiang-MA262-SP18.pdf](#)

[Catlett-Rob-EC101-SP18.pdf](#)

[Honors Econ Evaluation AY 2017-2018.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Intermediate Microeconomics

Intermediate Macroeconomics

These two courses are the central part of the economics core and their place logically follows the beginning course in this *Course Group Assessment*. (Although unlikely, we may transpose this assessment sequence with Year Four if the mathematics BS/BSE moves its assessment of statistics because statistics is required for both mathematics and economics.)

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Non-Core Economics courses - These courses facilitate additional student learning and exposure to economic analysis in areas of economics. Each of these *economics electives* is intended to expand and enhance the theories, principles, and laws the economics major should have acquired in the beginning and intermediate core courses.

The metaphor of a tree may help for those less familiar with economics. Micro and macro economics along with the quantitative elements embedded in them might resemble the trunk of a tree. The areas of economics resemble branches of a tree (i.e., branching out from micro, macro, or elements of both); they are far too numerous to require of an undergraduate student with a major in economics to take a course in every area of economics. We are not aware of any university requiring something like this. In fact, we pay close attention to the norms periodically published in the American Economic Review related to the undergraduate major in economics and the ESU economics program aligns well in hours, content, scope, and sequence.

Attached Files

[Course Requirements for Bachelors in Economics](#)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Economics BS

Responsible Roles: Brian Hollenbeck (E10087863), Rob Catlett (E10000227)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Mathematics BS/BSE

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Program level outcomes will be assessed using MA470, Teaching Mathematics in the Middle/High School.

Summary 2017 (Year 1)

Based on the three-year data, the mathematics program at ESU is doing an outstanding job of preparing students for their first year as a mathematics educator. Data collected on the candidates are reviewed on an annual basis. All data are aggregated during the summer and then presented to the faculty for review in the fall. From this initial review, recommendations and program changes are made to strengthen the candidates' performance in relation to the mathematics licensure standards. Data and recommendations are brought to the faculty for further review when needed. There is always room for improvement, and the faculty in the mathematics program is constantly evaluating and improving courses in order to ensure that students are well prepared to enter the classroom.

After reviewing the Praxis content exams a new option was made available to candidates to take a capstone seminar course, MA 410 Mathematical Connections. This course allows the candidates to review the mathematics they have taken over the four years, make presentations to the MA 125 Introduction to Mathematics course and evaluate how the courses they have completed will impact their teaching. Some of the candidates work on an individual plan to remediate in an area that they may have shown a weakness through one of the assessments. Although the course is not required many candidates are advised to take it as a final preparation to be successful in the classroom. It was decided not to make it required because the data does not show it is needed for all candidates.

Our professors are continually reviewing courses to include appropriate technology as new tools become available. New software has been purchased and the candidates are using the computer lab in the majority of their courses. Training on the newest technologies was held on campus for candidates and interested faculty twice in the past 4 years. All mathematics classes have components using technology that they will find helpful in the classroom when appropriate and limiting use when necessary. The data showed that the candidates would benefit from more manipulative use and so the required manipulative kit was revised.

Summary 2018 (Year 2)

Portfolio Assessment

Demonstrate competence in fundamental mathematics content:

All of the students met this content goal. Only 3 of the students had trouble with any of the competencies for content. These were students whose GPAs are lower and they continue to struggle to complete a couple of the classes.

Demonstrate the ability to understand and develop mathematical proofs:

This assessment allowed students to document proofs from previous courses by including them in the portfolio. The same 3 students were the only ones that will need to continue to work in this area.

Demonstrate the ability to communicate mathematics:

This is the outcome where this assessment was able to document the students' abilities to communicate mathematically. For the majority of students, they did extremely well communicating why they included the selected items and how these items met the standard.

See the Data Files for rubric and data.

Summary 2019 (Year 3)

Summary 2020 (Year 4)

Attached Files

- [Assessment 1c d Secondary Data Tables for Praxis PLC.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table for TWS Factors 1-4 and KPTC 1 2 secondary.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table for Secondary Clinical Experiences.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table for Secondary Course Grades.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Course Name and Number.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide for Course Grades.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table for Secondary Portfolio.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Portfolio Rubric.docx](#)
- [BSE SecondaryMiddleSchoolMath Program of Study.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Math 6-12 Report.docx](#)
- [Assessment 1a b Secondary Data Tables for Praxis Content.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Secondary Data Table for TWS Factors 5-7 and KPTP.docx](#)
- [Math Ed Exit Interview Spring18.docx](#)
- [Fall 2017 Exit Interview for Mathematics Education majors.docx](#)
- [Math Standards Portfolio Rubric 2018.docx](#)
- [Portfolio Data 2018.csv](#)
- [Assessment 1 c d middle level data tables - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 1a b Middle Level Data Tables for Praxis Content - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table for Middle Level Mathematics TWS 1-4 and KPTP 1-2 - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table for Middle Level Clinical Experiences - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table for Middle Level TWS Factors 5-7 and KPTP - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Course Name and Number Middle Level Mathematics.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table for Middle level Course Grades - Copy.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide for Course Grades.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table for Middle Level Portfolio.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Portfolio Rubric.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Math 5-8 Report.docx](#)
- [BSE Secondary Middle Schl Math Program of Study.docx](#)
- [Abotteen-Essam-MA111-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Abotteen-Essam-MA111-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Akers-Adelaide-MA161-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Akers-Adelaide-MA161-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Harrell-Marvin-MA291-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Harrell-Marvin-MA308-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Harrell-Marvin-MA125-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Kornowski-Robert-MA156-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Harrell-Marvin-MA313-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Harrell-Marvin-MA341-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hollenbeck-Brian-MA156-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miller-Daniel-MA111-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Shi-Qiang-MA262-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wells-Kindra-MA111-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Calculus/Miscellaneous

MA161 Calculus I

MA262 Calculus II

MA363 Calculus III

MA125 Introduction to Mathematics

MA460 History of Mathematics

The Undergraduate Mathematics and Mathematics Education Curriculum Committee has developed an assessment plan for the 2017-2018 that involves MA 125 Introduction to Mathematics, the calculus sequence (MA 161, MA 262, and MA 363), and MA 460 History of Math. In MA 125, the students completed a questionnaire at the beginning of the semester. This questionnaire contained items about the students' backgrounds and their knowledge of the department and extracurricular activities. A similar questionnaire will be administered during the last week of the semester to gauge the effectiveness of the class. In the calculus sequence, students will be given a quiz as part of their preparation for the final exam. This quiz will be used to determine if the course outcomes are being met. As for MA 460, a student project will be assessed to determine if students can discuss mathematics in historical context, which is a major outcome for the course. By the end of the 2017-2018, the committee will review the data to determine if changes need to be made to the courses that are under review.

Summary 2018 (Year 2)

As for the calculus sequence, in MA 161 Calculus I and MA 262 Calculus II students completed a short ten-question quiz to assess the students' content knowledge for those two courses. The students were told these quizzes were to help prepare them for final exams by assessing their understanding of key concepts. As a whole, students performed well on the skill-based items that were tested by the Gateway Exams in these two courses, while there were mixed results for those items that were conceptual in nature or direct applications of differentiation and integration. In particular, students did poorly with the idea of continuity, implicit differentiation and related-rate problems in Calculus I, and the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus, volumes and arc length in Calculus II. In addition, students in Calculus II struggled with sequences and series. A discussion pursued about possibly moving these topics to Calculus III and move multivariate calculus to Calculus II. It was decided to have an open forum in the next academic year to further discuss this idea, but to think about waiting to do any curricular changes immediately since we have just moved the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus to Calculus I.

Much of the items that were discussed or assigned in MA 125 Introduction to Mathematics was very effective in introducing the students to the department and faculty expectations. All, but two, who enrolled in the course were successful. One student changed her major early in the semester and the other student stopped attending class and did not complete the required assignments. An end of the semester survey of the students showed that all the activities in the class were seen in a positive light, with the exception of the assignment that introduced the students to the local community. This assignment may be removed from the course or modified the next time it is taught.

In the course History of Mathematics, MA 460, students were assessed on four major task in the class. These tasks included a first person report about a mathematician from history; writing assessment questions and taking a quiz over the reading of *Mathematicians are People Too*; researching the mathematics connected to an assigned mathematician with a written report and a class presentation; and teaching a period in the history of mathematics. On all four tasks, all students score at least a 90%.

The Department of Mathematics and Economics believe that the courses assess this academic year are functioning well but will continue to monitor these courses this coming academic year and to continue to talk about possible future changes. Furthermore, those in attendance discussed new programs, including the current informatics program and a possible actuarial program. Those in attendance felt that our next faculty new hire should be a person with a statistics background who would possibly help in these two areas.

Attached Files

[Akera-Adelaide-MA161-SP18.pdf](#)

[Akera-Adelaide-MA161-FA17.pdf](#)

[Harrell-Marvin-MA125-FA17.pdf](#)

[Shi-Qiang-MA262-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Applied courses

MA130 Problem-solving with computers

MA291 Mathematical Modeling

MA380 Probability and Statistics

MA731 Statistics using SAS

Summary 2019 (Year 3)

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Proof-based classes

MA240 Discrete Mathematics

MA322 Linear Algebra

MA421 College Geometry

MA425 Abstract Algebra

MA735 Advanced Calculus I

Summary 2020 (Year 4)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Mathematics BS/BSE

Responsible Roles: Brian Hollenbeck (E10087863), Rob Catlett (E10000227)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Mathematics MS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Year 1: Graduate committee meets to plan data collection for years 2-4

Years 2-4: Each year, we will gather assessment data from the following sources

MA 701

One course in the analysis area (MA 735 in Fall 2017)

One course in the algebra area (MA 741 in Fall 2017)

One course in the statistics/applied area (MA 532 in Fall 2017)

Graduate student seminar presentations

Comprehensive exams (for graduating students)

Year 5: Graduate committee meets to evaluate assessment data and suggest program changes, if necessary.

When planning our assessment strategy for the M.S. program in mathematics, the graduate committee decided to focus on the three content areas of our program: analysis, algebra, and statistics/applied mathematics. Since we require students to take at least one course from each area in order to complete the degree, the committee deemed it important to evaluate student performance in those classes. Since students are allowed to choose different courses from within each area, the committee decided to choose one course from each area each year for assessment.

In addition to assessing particular courses, we have created a new rubric for evaluating student seminar presentations. We continue to use performance on comprehensive exams to assess content retention at the end of the program. And we will continue our annual program assessment forums to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the program as a whole.

Summary 2018 (Year 2)

For the Fall 2017 semester, we implemented a new rubric to score the MA810 seminars in the categories of mathematical content, use of language, central result, organization, and visual aids. Each category is scored as 0 (below expectations), 1 (benchmark), 2 (milestone), or 3 (exemplary). *After analyzing the data from 16 seminars, the median score for all categories is a 2.*

We have continued to collect data on comprehensive exams. Each attempted exam is recorded as pass, weak pass, or fail, and whether or not the attempt is a retake of a previous exam. The student pass rate for comprehensive exams has remained steady. In AY2017, the pass rate was 86.2% (75/87), and in AY2018, the pass rate was 81.8% (72/88). Toward the issue of academic dishonesty, more professors are requiring students to take exams at testing centers. Faculty continue share information about all instances of academic dishonesty by recording each case in a shared spreadsheet.

To help increase attendance to oral seminars, the times are being shared on the Math Department Graduate Student course on Canvas. A consistent Zoom room is used so that online students can join any seminar. Records of seminars are posted on Canvas. Some faculty are require students enrolled in MA810 to attend or review a minimum number of oral seminars. This both encourages attendance and provides students with examples of how an oral seminar talk should be structured.

Summary 2019 (Year 3)

Summary 2020 (Year 4)

Attached Files

- [LAS-MC-MATHEMATICS-MS](#)
- [810scores.xlsx](#)
- [Math Exit Interview Spring18.docx](#)
- [Fall 2017 Graduate Student Exit Interview.docx](#)
- [Fall 2017 Graduate Courses Online Evaluation Results.docx](#)
- [Comp Exams and the results.xlsx](#)
- [Grad Assessment Forum \(4-25-18\).docx](#)
- [MA810 Rubric.pdf](#)
- [Abotteen-Essam-MA741-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Akers-Adelaide-MA701-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Wiley-Chad-MA735-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Mahoney-Thomas-MA701-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Scott-Larry-MA532-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Harrell-Marvin-MA510-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Hollenbeck-Brian-MA735-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wiley-Chad-MA736-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

This year we will be gathering data from MA701, MA735 (for Analysis area), MA741 (for Algebra area), and MA532 (for Statistics/Applied area). We will also examine data from graduate student seminar presentations and comprehensive exams for graduating students.

Summary 2018 (Year 2)

In the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters, we assessed several courses covering the areas of Algebra, Analysis, and Statistics/Applied Math. Our assessment consisted of faculty reporting final grades and providing data on how many students exceeded, met, or did not meet expectations. In Analysis we assessed MA735 Advanced Calculus I and MA736 Advanced Calculus II. In Algebra, we assessed MA741 Group Theory. In Statistics/Applied Math we assessed MA32 Mathematical Statistics I. We also assessed MA701 Mathematical Proofs in both the Fall and Spring semesters, as well as MA510 Technology in Mathematics in the Fall. Aside from MA701, no course had a large number of students who did not meet expectations. The purpose of MA701 is to prepare students for the other courses in the graduate program. The high rates of students meeting expectations in other proof courses indicates that MA701 is successfully preparing students for those courses.

Attached Files

- [Akera-Adelaide-MA701-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Hollenbeck-Brian-MA735-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Mahoney-Thomas-MA701-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wiley-Chad-MA736-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wiley-Chad-MA735-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Scott-Larry-MA532-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Harrell-Marvin-MA510-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Abotteen-Essam-MA741-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

This year we will be gathering data from MA701, MA??? (for Analysis area), MA??? (for Algebra area), and MA??? (for Statistics/Applied area). We will also examine data from graduate student seminar presentations and comprehensive exams for graduating students.

Summary 2019 (Year 3)

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

This year we will be gathering data from MA701, MA??? (for Analysis area), MA??? (for Algebra area), and MA??? (for Statistics/Applied area). We will also examine data from graduate student seminar presentations and comprehensive exams for graduating students.

Summary 2020 (Year 4)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Mathematics MS

Responsible Roles: Brian Hollenbeck (E10087863), Rob Catlett (E10000227)

**UNIT REPORT****Music Assessment Report 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:00 AM

Music Assessment Plan**Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

The goal for the coming year will be to update the curriculum in preparation for the NASM self-study of 2020. Courses will be reviewed for relevance to the curriculum. Additionally, all course syllabi will be aligned with university assessment goals and the corresponding goal will be listed in the syllabus.

After review of the applied lesson jury rubrics, the faculty determined that no changes will be made at this time. We will continue to review periodically.

AY 2017

This year the faculty will be evaluating the results of the applied lesson jury rubrics. We will determine if there are global areas that need to be addressed in any specific music skill set. All rubrics are compiled for ease of evaluation.

AY 2016

The music faculty completed curriculum maps for all baccalaureate and graduate degree programs. Items were identified as a result of the mapping processes that provided direction for future assessment efforts.

AY 2015

The Music department has a highly structured assessment program that includes direction from both the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and the Kansas Department of Education. All students who complete a degree in music education are led by standards adopted by the state of Kansas to insure competency through degree credentials and licensure. All students completing bachelors of arts and master of music degrees complete program requirements and specialize in vocal and instrumental concentrations. On an annual basis assessment of the programs follows the procedures set forth by KSDE and NASM.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

The department is completing assessment of courses for year 2 of the 5 year cycle. Assessment of courses in the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle will be reviewed. Data from courses for year 3 will be uploaded. The faculty will examine the data to determine what, if any changes need to be made to the selected courses.

AY 2017

The Music department has transitioned its programs to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plans. The data gathered as a part of the applied lesson jury rubrics is uploaded in the file library. Courses identified for assessment in years two through four are listed and assessments will be completed and reported.

AY 2016

The BME program was in the assessment cycle with the Department of Education. The faculty collected data for this area. For the BM in Performance and the MM in Performance, the faculty evaluated the new applied lesson jury rubrics that were developed in 2015. For the BA degree the faculty expanded the yearly meeting with students that is currently used for the BME students. For the MM in Music Education the faculty assessed the course offerings required for the music education portion of the degree.

AY 2015

Over the course of the year we identified some areas where we want to focus efforts. This SWOT analysis helped to determine those things which we value and do well. In addition, we were able to identify a couple of areas where we will focus efforts in improving the student learning experience (see attached Strategic Planning report in evidence and report folder).

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - MUSIC 2014](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - MUSIC 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - MUSIC 2016](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Music - AY2017](#)
- [BA Checklist](#)
- [BA Student Assessment](#)
- [Music Department strategic plan 9-8-2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - MUSIC 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Music - AY2018](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - MUSIC 2018](#)

Program Name: Music BA

Summary of Program Assessments:**AY2018**

The BM in Performance has been reduced to 120 credit hours. This was accomplished through a reduction in elective hours. The BM in Music Education will also be reduced to 120 credit hours. The faculty are currently reviewing the curriculum to determine if any changes can be made to the music curriculum to accomplish this goal. NASM requires that the music courses in the degree be no less than 60 credit hours. The music curriculum is currently at 61 hours. The department is working with the chair of the general education council to determine which music courses can fulfill general education requirements in various disciplines.

AY2017

The Music BA program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan. The courses for capstone and annual review have been identified and the rubric has been uploaded to the file library.

AY 2016

The faculty will review how to enrich the second field offerings. They will also evaluate the effectiveness of the yearly meetings with BA students.

AY 2015

The bachelors of arts degree in music shares the majority of the curriculum with the BME degree program. However, the NASM provides a genuine structure for the curriculum affiliated with the BA degree. These standards are covered in the [National Association of Schools of Music](#) (NASM) website. In addition to the KSDE standards, the BA program includes some specialized courses that provides student learning of music vocals including individual and group work. The assessment of these particular learning experiences is conducted in a cyclical nature to compliment the overall music students learning. The first iteration of this cycle is scheduled to begin in the Fall of 2016 where the goal is to identify specific student works and performances. These assessments will be scored by individual and juries of faculty using a standard rubric developed by the faculty.

Attached Files

- [LAS-MU-MUSIC-BA](#)

Program Name: Music BM - BME

Summary of Program Assessments:**AY2018**

The KSDE report for the Bachelor of Music Education has been completed and submitted for review to the Associate Dean of the Teachers College for submission to the Kansas Department of Education in October.

AY2017

The KSDE report for the Bachelor of Music Education has been completed and submitted for review to the Associate Dean of the Teachers

College for submission to the Kansas Department of Education in October.

AY2016

The assessment plan for the Bachelor of Music Education is structured on the standards of The Teachers College framework and the Kansas Department of Education. The accompanying report and data files present the assessment strategies, data results and findings, and strategies for improvement of student learning. Specifically section V of the KSDE report details the progress of the program and change strategies that have or are to be implemented in the short term (see evidence files in the file library).

AY2015

Each year assessment data is reviewed by members of the Music Education Committee and serves as part of conversation regarding the curriculum as it relates specifically to requirements for the Vocal Music program.

Prior Years Assessment Information

2010 - 2011

Curricular review is an ongoing process within the music education program initiated by the faculty committee that reviews this assessment data. Currently, the entire program is being reviewed within the framework of paring down the curriculum from the current 161 hours closer to 140-146 hours. It is anticipated that this review and subsequent changes will take 2-3 years to complete. These assessment data are one of the foundations for this curricular review.

2011 - 2012

-The music faculty parred down the curriculum from 161 hours to 140 hours.

-The music faculty decided to combine the following degrees: Bachelor of Music Performance and Bachelor of Music Education. The new degree will be called the Bachelor of Music with Emphasis in Music Education.

2012 - 2013

-The music faculty started a methods course rotation to maximize faculty resources.

-The music faculty submitted paperwork to the Emporia State University administration and the Kansas Board of Regents to seek permission to combine the degrees.

Each year assessment data is reviewed by members of the Music Education Committee and serves as part of conversation regarding the curriculum as it relates specifically to requirements for the Instrumental Music program.

2010 - 2011

Curricular review is an ongoing process within the music education program initiated by the faculty committee that reviews this assessment data. Currently, the entire program is being reviewed within the framework of paring down the curriculum from the current 161 hours closer to 140-146 hours. It is anticipated that this review and subsequent changes will take 2-3 years to complete. These assessment data are one of the foundations for this curricular review.

2011 - 2012

-The music faculty parred down the curriculum from 161 hours to 140 hours.

-The music faculty decided to combine the following degrees: Bachelor of Music Performance and Bachelor of Music Education. The new degree will be called the Bachelor of Music with Emphasis in Music Education.

2012 - 2013

-The music faculty started a methods course rotation to maximize faculty resources.

-The music faculty submitted paperwork to the Emporia State University administration and the Kansas Board of Regents to seek permission to combine the degrees.

Attached Files

[1 Ins Assessment #1 Data Tables](#)

- [1 Voc Assessment #1 Data Tables](#)
- [2 Ins Assessment #2 Data Tables](#)
- [2 Voc Assessment #2 Data Tables](#)
- [3 Ins Assessment #3 Data Tables 2](#)
- [3 Voc Assessment #3 Data Tables](#)
- [4 Ins Assessment #4 Data Table](#)
- [4 Voc Assessment #4 Data Table](#)
- [5 Ins Assessment #5 Data Table](#)
- [5 Voc Assessment #5 Data Table](#)
- [6 Ins Assessment #6 Data Tables](#)
- [6 Voc Assessment #6 Data Tables](#)
- [BM Ed Checklist](#)
- [InstrumentalMusic1213](#)
- [VocalMusic1213](#)
- [2 Voc Assessment #2 Data Tables 16-17](#)
- [3 Voc Assessment #3 Data Tables 16-17](#)
- [4 Voc Assessment #4 Data Table 16-17](#)
- [5 Voc Assessment #5 Data Table16-17](#)
- [6 Voc Assessment #6 Data Tables16-17](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Vocal_KSDE 16-17](#)
- [1 Voc Assessment #1 Data Tables 16-17](#)
- [6 Ins Assessment #6 Data Tables 16-17](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Ins_KSDE 16-17](#)
- [1 Ins Assessment #1 Data Tables 16-17](#)
- [2 Ins Assessment #2 Data Tables 16-17](#)
- [3 Ins Assessment #3 Data Tables 2 16-17](#)
- [4 Ins Assessment #4 Data Table 16-17](#)
- [5 Ins Assessment #5 Data Table 16-17](#)
- [LAS-MU-MUSIC-BM-BME](#)
- [2 Voc Assessment #2 Data Tables 15-16](#)
- [3 Ins Assessment #3 Data Tables 2 15-16](#)
- [3 Voc Assessment #3 Data Tables 15-16](#)
- [4 Ins Assessment #4 Data Table 15-16](#)
- [4 Voc Assessment #4 Data Table 15-16](#)
- [5 Ins Assessment #5 Data Table 15-16](#)
- [5 Voc Assessment #5 Data Table15-16](#)
- [6 Ins Assessment #6 Data Tables 15-16](#)
- [6 Voc Assessment #6 Data Tables15-16](#)
- [InstrumentalMusic1516](#)
- [VocalMusic1516](#)
- [1 Ins Assessment #1 Data Tables 15-16](#)
- [1 Voc Assessment #1 Data Tables 15-16](#)
- [2 Ins Assessment #2 Data Tables 15-16](#)
- [Assessment #1 Data Tables 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)
- [Assessment #2 Data Tables 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)
- [Assessment #2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment #4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment #3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment #3 Data Tables 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)

- [Assessment #4 Data Table 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)
- [Assessment #5 Data Table 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)
- [Assessment #6 Data Tables 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)
- [Assessment #6 SS ET Proficiency Example.pdf](#)
- [Assessment #7 Data Table 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)
- [Assessment #7 Vocal Piano Proficiency Exam.pdf](#)
- [Assessment #8 Data Table 16-17 Vocal.docx](#)
- [Assessment #8 Jury Rubric Voice.pdf](#)
- [ESU KSDE Vocal Music Report.docx](#)
- [Music Ed Vocal Program of Study.pdf](#)
- [Assessment #1 Ins Music Data Tables 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment #2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment #2 Ins Music Data Tables 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment #3 Ins Music Data Tables 2 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment #4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment #4 Ins Music Data Table 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment #5 Ins Music Data Table 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #6 Ins Music Data Tables 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #6 SS ET Proficiency Example.pdf](#)
- [Assessment #7 Ins Music Data Table 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #7 Ins Piano Proficiency Exam.pdf](#)
- [Assessment #8 Jury Rubric Percussion.pdf](#)
- [Assessment #8 Ins Music Data Tables 16-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment #8 Jury Rubric String.pdf](#)
- [Assessment #8 Jury Rubric Woodwind and Brass.pdf](#)
- [Instrumental Music Ed Program of Study.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE Instrumental Music Report.docx](#)

Program Name: Music BM - Performance

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

The applied lesson jury rubric was reviewed by the music faculty. It was determined that no changes need to be made to the rubrics at this time. Courses in the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plan are being reviewed.

AY2017

The Music BM Performance program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan. The courses for capstone and annual review have been identified and the rubric has been uploaded to the file library.

AY2016

The new applied jury rubric will be evaluated. It was converted to an electronic format that is uploaded to a shared-file format that allows students to access the completed rubrics immediately. This new format has improved interrater reliability.

AY2015

The assessment structure supports the measuring of student learning for both skills and dispositions and includes scoring student performance by using jury scored rubrics and the performance checklist (shown in evidence files). The current cycle of assessment using these measures is scheduled to begin in the fall 2016 semester. The assessment consists of rubrics scoring for each of the defined performance objectives for Bachelor of Music - Performance majors. The juries consist of members of the music faculty.

Attached Files

- [BM Jury Rubric Woodwinds and Brass](#)
- [BM Jury Rubric Percussion](#)

[BM Jury Rubric String](#)

[BM Jury Rubric Voice](#)

[BM Performance Checklist](#)

[BM Student Assessment](#)

[LAS-MU-MUSIC-BM-PERFORMANCE](#)

Program Name: Music MM - MME

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The KSDE report for the Master of Music Education has been completed and submitted for review to the Associate Dean of the Teachers College for submission to the Kansas Department of Education in October. In order to accommodate online students in the MM Music Education degree program, the music history courses are now being offered online as well as face-to-face. Content delivery has been somewhat challenging, so the online version of the course has been modified to better meet the needs of this constituency.

AY 2017

The KSDE report for the Master of Music Education has been completed and submitted for review to the Associate Dean of the Teachers College for submission to the Kansas Department of Education in October.

AY 2016

The faculty reviewed the required courses for the music education portion of the curriculum to see if adjustments were needed. The plan is to determine the alignment between the KSDE standards (as these have been under revision) and to place assessments throughout the curriculum to determine if learning goals are being met and to report findings accordingly. This exercise will provide future direction for improvement strategies.

Attached Files

[LAS-MU-MUSIC-MM-MME](#)

Program Name: Music MM - Performance

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The applied lesson jury rubric is now being used for the capstone project (masters recital). Only minor modifications were necessary to the rubric. The graduate faculty will review the rubric for efficacy.

AY 2017

The Music MM Performance program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan. The courses for capstone and annual review have been identified and the rubric has been uploaded to the file library.

AY 2016

The faculty evaluated the usefulness of the entrance exams for the MM. The determination was made to remove the entrance exams.

Attached Files

[LAS-MU-MUSIC-MM-PERFORMANCE](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The Music department has done a nice job transitioning its program level assessments to the 5-Year plans. The courses to be assessed are identified, along with the recognition that some additions will be made to rubrics to score students academic components of the programs. The faculty used the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes reporting tool to report assessment of general education courses and those identified in the 5-year plans for year 2 of the cycles. Their student learning improvement strategies were varied based on the type of course. As more faculty become familiar with entering their course level assessments in the reporting tool, it should become easier. Yet, so much of the instruction is one-on-one and small group that the faculty are adapting their pedagogy and instruction as it is necessary, probably more so on a day-to-day and week-to-week basis as students gain knowledge and skills. I can see the music faculty reporting during semester change strategies, even more so than term-to-term strategies. I'll be encouraged to see how this next years (AY2019) round of course assessments

turn out. Probably the biggest challenge for the department this past year was identifying how to re-align and carve out the curriculum to reduce program completion hours to 120. This may cause a need to adapt/update the curriculum maps for those programs affected by the hourly reduction. The continued use of the Juried Rubrics has proven productive and the fact the faculty are comfortable with the quality of the rubrics is a good thing. The completion of the Kansas Department of Education assessment reports was excellent work, as this process is intensive and is also supporting of the CAEP review that is currently occurring, as well. Coming off the NASM review, the department has positioned itself to continue to improve its programs. All of these multiple layers of assessment are taxing on the faculty and the hard work and efforts are greatly appreciated. Continue to encourage faculty to improve student learning in their assigned courses and the overall affect is going to be very productive! Our students are appreciative of the individual and small group instruction as this is where they are able to make the most progress in their learning! Thanks for all that you do, and I'll look forward to working with your faculty on their assessment endeavors in the upcoming year!

Academic Year 2017

The Juried Rubrics which the faculty have developed are awesome! This assessment work is aligned with best practice and the use of the rubric keeps your assessment practices for applied learning aligned across multiple faculty assessing individual and group student performances. The inclusion of the students in this process is also very encouraging. Kudos to the faculty and their commitment to this process! As the department adapts to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans, the next step will engage faculty in course-embedded assessment practices for all courses with various content dedicated to history, composition, methods, theory, application, and pedagogy. This additional layer of assessment strategies will provide the department with valuable data and affiliated student learning improvement strategies and will be key in identifying the strengths and opportunities for improvement within the courses that make up the curriculum. The 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plans create an environment where the faculty can control the structure of the course curriculum and comprehensively make changes at the course and individual lesson student learning experience levels. The department has made some significant changes and improvements based on data from the Applied Jury Rubrics assessments, and it will be exciting to see how student learning experiences improve as a function of the course embedded assessment strategies. It is believed that as department faculty engage in course-embedded assessment practices throughout the 5-Year cycle, the outcomes of this work will directly relate to improved student learning experiences and student success in their respective programs of study. The current assessment efforts of the faculty and the assessment of general education courses is greatly appreciated! I look forward to working with the department in the upcoming year as it adapts to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans. Keep up the dedication and continue to engage faculty in dialogue based on what you find out in your assessment activities! Thanks for all you do!

Academic Year 2016

The Music department has made some significant progress over the past year with aligning assessment efforts to improve the student learning experience. The use of a common rubric will serve the department well. This strategy not only provides faculty with a tool that ensures consistency in student performance evaluation, it serves to inform students of expectations. This structure for evaluating student music performance will serve the department well. Be sure to place the rubrics data in the file library either at the department level or within the programs where the rubrics are used for assessments. The curriculum mapping exercises should provide the faculty within each of the programs some key information on where to prioritize assessment efforts going forward. Also, the requirements for NASM will guide assessment efforts as well. Be sure to upload any reports for specialized accreditation in the file library. Begin to plan assessment in terms of annual cycles where you prioritize assessment efforts on those things faculty deem important. If the department faculty can identify a few key areas to improve student learning across the board, you can use the curriculum maps to identify the key courses where contributions are made to these areas. Be sure to engage students in this process, keep the communication lines open and seek feedback often. This can lead to recognition for change strategies related to course sequencing, individual course, or groups of courses that are hindering student success. Engage faculty to implement improvement strategies and build assessment efforts around planned cycles, so faculty can know their roles and responsibilities. This will drive assessment strategies and continuous improvements over time. Another change option is looking at updating the curriculum, implementing new pedagogy or changing delivery methods. This is best done at the course level, but can be implemented across multiple courses based on course content. The key to keeping the curriculum current is to consistently engage faculty in assessment processes with the goal of enhancing the student learning experience. These assessment practices should be pre-planned, know what you are wanting to improve and seek to measure student learning in these areas. You have to know where you are at before you can plan to move forward. The success of students is paramount and faculty working together to improve student learning is key. Keep up the good efforts and continue to engage the faculty in these processes.

Academic Year 2015

The Music department's assessment program is influenced by two external entities, the Kansas Department of Education and the National Association of Schools of Music. These guidelines and requirements require assessments at entrance, during, and upon degree completion for both bachelor and master level degrees. Degrees offered which prepare students for careers in music education at the high school or college levels must meet skill and disposition competencies and licensure exam score thresholds. The structure to accomplish these

directives is in place and the faculty have spent the past year updating and finalizing their departmental strategic plan (2015-2025) which aligns with the University's *The Adaptive University* strategic plan. Faculty involvement in reviewing the current program learning objectives and aligning course student learning outcomes to program objectives will benefit the department in the upcoming year. As the faculty engage in the assessment strategies as planned for the upcoming fall semester, it will be productive and valuable to identify where student learning is strong and to seek potential areas of focus to improve learning experiences. Assessment at the graduate level has growth opportunities, again these conversations among faculty should serve to identify areas of emphasis for change strategies and to align future assessment strategies. It is important to include the rubrics with affiliated scores (summative level) and analysis and to share student learning strategies adopted as an outcome of assessment findings. Good structure, keep up the pace with the reporting of outcomes and learning strategies.

Providing Department: Music

Responsible Roles:

Allan Comstock (E10000951), Gaile Stephens (E10893728), Andrew Houchins (E10000157), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Music BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The Core Skills components of the program will assess the music theory sequence (MU 118/119/218), Sight Singing/Ear Training (MU 108/109/208), Group Piano (MU 131/132), MU 477 Basic Conducting, MU 324 World Music, and the music history courses (MU 328 and 329).

The performance component of the program will assess applied lessons, music ensembles, MU 391 Chamber Music, and MU 575 Senior Recital.

We currently use a performance rubric to evaluate the performance piece. We will be adding an academic portion to the rubric to evaluate the academic components of the program.

Summary 2018

During year 2 of the assessment cycle, applied lessons and MU 575 Senior Recital were evaluated. Based on data collected from the applied lessons jury rubric (including student feedback) it was determined that the department has developed more cohesion in the scale piece of the jury. In order to pass from the 200 level to the 400 level, students must be able to perform scales in a range appropriate to their instrument. For advancement from 400 to 500 level, students must demonstrate the ability to perform scales throughout the full range of their instrument. For both level changes, students must demonstrate that they understand the relationship between major and minor scales. Students not attaining a minimum 80% accuracy are required to redo the scale performance until meeting that threshold.

The improvement strategy for applied lessons will be to work toward additional communication with students about the procedures for performing scales.

For assessing MU 575 Senior Recital, the department uses a modified version of the applied lesson jury rubric. Before a student is allowed to present the senior recital, he/she must reach 500 level in applied lessons. Once this has been accomplished, the student may present a recital preview. During the preview, the student is assessed for preparedness of music. A student must achieve a minimum score of 80% on the preview. Any works not meeting this threshold will need to be presented again to the recital preview committee, which is made up of area faculty. Students receive a copy of the rubric completed by each committee member, as well as verbal feedback.

The improvement strategy for MU 575 will be to work toward additional communication with students about the requirements for passing the recital preview. This is currently communicated to the student on a weekly basis at their applied lesson. An expanded explanation will be added to the music student handbook.

Summary 2019

Summary 2020

Summary 2021

Attached Files

- [LAS-MU-MUSIC-BA](#)
- [Bergman-Catherine-MU226-Film-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Budke-Tiffany-MU226-Pop-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Budke-Tiffany-MU226-RockRoll-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Miranda-Ramiro-MU254-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miranda-Ramiro-MU319-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miranda-Ramiro-MU253-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Budke-Tiffany-MU226-Pop-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Bergman-Catherine-MU226-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miranda-Ramiro-MU391-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miranda-Ramiro-MU454-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Woodworth-William-MU226-Film-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Woodworth-William-MU494-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

In year 2, we will assess applied lessons and MU 575.

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

In year 3, we will assess music ensembles (MU 244, MU 245, MU 310, MU 316, and 319), chamber music (MU 312, MU 318 and MU 391), and MU 477 Basic Conducting.

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

In year 4, we will assess Group Piano (MU 131 and 132), Ear Training/Sight Singing (MU 108, 109, 208), music theory (MU 118, 119, 218), music history (MU 328 and 329), and MU 324 World Music.

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Music BA

Responsible Roles: Allan Comstock (E10000951)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Music BM-Performance

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The Core Skills components of the program will assess the music theory sequence (MU 118/119/218/219), Sight Singing/Ear Training (MU 108/109/208/209), Group Piano (MU 131-134), MU 477 Basic Conducting, MU 324 World Music, and the music history courses (MU 328 and 329).

The performance component of the program will assess applied lessons, music ensembles, MU 391 Chamber Music, and the Junior/Senior Recitals (MU 375/575).

The professional knowledge component of the program will assess an instrument specific pedagogy course (both vocal and instrumental emphases) plus MU 321/322 Vocal Diction I/II, and 741 Art Song for voice students.

We currently use a performance rubric to evaluate the performance piece. We will be adding an academic portion to the rubric to evaluate the academic components of the program.

Summary 2018

During year 2 of the assessment cycle, applied lessons, MU 375 Junior Recital, MU 575 Senior Recital, and instrument-specific pedagogy courses were evaluated. Based on data collected from the applied lessons jury rubric (including student feedback) it was determined that the department has developed more cohesion in the scale piece of the jury. In order to pass from the 200 level to the 400 level, students must be able to perform scales in a range appropriate to their instrument. For advancement from 400 to 500 level, students must demonstrate the ability to perform scales throughout the full range of their instrument. For both level changes, students must demonstrate that they understand the relationship between major and minor scales. Students not attaining a minimum 80% accuracy are required to redo the scale performance until meeting that threshold.

The improvement strategy for applied lessons will be to work toward additional communication with students about the procedures for performing scales.

The assessment procedures for MU 375 Junior Recital and MU 575 Senior Recital are similar as both utilize a modified version of the applied lesson jury rubric. Before a student is allowed to present the junior or senior recital, he/she must reach 400 level in applied lessons for the junior recital and 500 level in applied lessons for the senior recital. Once this has been accomplished, the student may present a recital preview. During the preview, the student is assessed for preparedness of music. A student must achieve a minimum score of 80% on the preview. Any works not meeting this threshold will need to be presented again to the recital preview committee, which is made up of area faculty. Students receive a copy of the rubric completed by each committee member, as well as verbal feedback.

The improvement strategy for both MU 375 and MU 575 will be to work toward additional communication with students about the requirements for passing the recital preview. This is currently communicated to the student on a weekly basis at their applied lesson. An expanded explanation will be added to the music student handbook.

Students pursuing the BM Music Performance degree take an instrument specific pedagogy course. This course is taught as an individual or small group course, depending upon the number of students who need the course in a given semester. Students are assessed for work on weekly projects, which culminate in a final project. Oral and written feedback is given to the student at each class session. Each instructor handles the course a little differently, but the outcomes are the same.

The improvement strategy for the pedagogy course will be to increase the number of supervised teaching experiences for the student.

Summary 2019

Summary 2020

Summary 2021

Attached Files

[LAS-MU-MUSIC-BM-PERFORMANCE](#)

[Jury Rubric Woodwind and Brass - Editable - Template 050616](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

In year 2, we will assess applied lessons, MU 375 and MU 575, and pedagogy (MU 371 and 524).

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

In year 3, we will assess music ensembles (MU 244, MU 245, MU 310, MU 316, and 319), chamber music (MU 312, MU 318 and MU 391), Vocal Diction (MU 320 and 321), MU 477 Basic Conducting, and MU 741 Art Song.

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

In year 4, we will assess Group Piano (MU 131-134), Ear Training/Sight Singing (MU 108, 109, 208 and 209), music theory (MU 118, 119, 218 and 219), music history (MU 328 and 329), and MU 324 World Music.

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Music BM-Performance

Responsible Roles: Allan Comstock (E10000951)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Music MM-Performance

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The research component of the program will assess courses MU 836 Techniques of Analysis, MU 838 Intro to Research in Music, and MU 804 Graduate Performance Research Project.

The performance component of the program will assess MU 800 Graduate Recital and applied lessons.

We currently use a performance rubric to evaluate the performance piece. We will be adding a research portion to the rubric to evaluate the research piece of the program.

Summary 2018

In year 2 of the assessment cycle, the department examined the following courses: MU 737 Music in the Romantic Period, music pedagogy courses, and MU 836 Techniques of Analysis.

MU 737 is a tradition lecture course in music history. Assessment pieces include exams, a research paper, class discussion and a class presentation. Instead of two exams using the same format, the instructor decided to provide the second test in a take-home format. Scores were approximately the same for both formats, although the students preferred the latter.

The improvement strategy for MU 737 will focus upon designing a more detailed evaluation form to provide feedback to students for the presentations.

Students pursuing the MM Music Performance degree take an instrument specific pedagogy course. This course is taught as an individual or small group course, depending upon the number of students who need the course in a given semester. Students are assessed for work on weekly projects, which culminate in a final project. Oral and written feedback is given to the student at each class session. Each instructor handles the course a little differently, but the outcomes are the same.

The improvement strategy for the pedagogy course will be to increase the number of supervised teaching experiences for the student.

MU 836 Techniques of Analysis is the required music theory course for MM students. The class is delivered online. Assessment instruments include weekly projects, exams, and a final project. The instructor adopted a modified approach to the weekly assignments, tying them more directly to the final project.

The improvement strategy for MU 836 will include continued refinement of the weekly assignments.

Summary 2019

Summary 2020**Summary 2021**

Attached Files

- [☐ LAS-MU-MUSIC-MM-PERFORMANCE](#)
- [☐ Jury Rubric Woodwind and Brass - Editable - Template 050616](#)
- [☐ Miranda-Ramiro-MU691-SP18.pdf](#)
- [☐ Miranda-Ramiro-MU853-SP18.pdf](#)
- [☐ Miranda-Ramiro-MU873-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

In year 2, we will assess MU 737 Music in the Romantic Period, music pedagogy courses, and MU 836 Techniques of Analysis.

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

In year 3, the following courses will be assessed: MU 610 A Cappella Choir, MU 630 Orchestra, MU 646 Symphonic Wind Ensemble, MU 744 Music of the Twentieth Century, and MU 838 Intro to Research in Music.

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

In year 4, the following courses will be assessed: MU 646 Symphonic Band, MU 691 Chamber Music, and MU 736 Music in the Classical Period.

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Music MM-Performance

Responsible Roles: Allan Comstock (E10000951), Gaile Stephens (E10893728), Andrew Houchins (E10000157)

UNIT REPORT

Nursing Annual Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:05 AM

**Department of Nursing Assessment Program****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

The Emporia State University Department of Nursing continues to engage in assessment using the model of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI). This year we will focus on implementation of our revised Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP and Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan and Report (SLOAP-R) based on the 2017 Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) standards. Data from the SEP and SLOAP-R will be gathered on an annual basis and compared in three year trends based on students performances on various defined metrics.

Overall, we have continued to maintain our robust assessment of the program and provide details as it happens, leading to quality outcomes. We have completed our reaccreditation and reapproval site visit with ACEN and KSBN and our assessment plan and process was in 100% compliance. Program and other outcomes are consistently at or above the state and national mean. This year based on assessment data we will revise the curriculum, expand the generic BSN program, and develop an on-line MSN and RN-BSN option within our nursing program for implementation over a two year timeframe.

AY 2017

The Emporia State University Department of Nursing continues to engage in assessment in a continuous cycle, specifically through our Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP) and Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan and Report (SLOAP-R). Some data points are gathered on an annual basis and compared in three year trends based on students performances on various defined metrics. There have been some changes brought about by our external accrediting body and some transitions occurring in governing bodies for nursing programs in general. Overall, we have continued to maintain our robust assessment of the program and provide details as it happens, leading to quality outcomes. We have completed our reaccreditation and reapproval site visit with ACEN and KSBN and our assessment plan and process was in compliance. Program and other outcomes are at or above the state and national mean.

AY 2016

The Emporia State University Department of Nursing continues to engage in assessment in a continuous cycle. Some data points are gathered on an annual basis and compared in three year trends based on students performances on various defined metrics. There have been some changes brought about by our external accrediting body and some transitions occurring in governing bodies for nursing programs in general. Overall, we have continued to maintain our robust assessment of the program and provide details as it happens, leading to quality outcomes.

AY 2015

The Emporia State University Department of Nursing engages in assessment in a continuous cycle. Some data points are gathered on an annual basis and compared in three year trends based on students performances on various defined metrics. There will be quite a bit of change and adaptations taking place in the upcoming year as our upcoming accreditation review cycle is on the horizon. There have been some changes brought about by our external accrediting body and some transitions occurring in governing bodies for nursing programs in general. Overall, we have maintained our robust assessment of the program and provide details as it happens

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

The methodology used by the Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Assessment Program continued to be provided through the framework of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of student learning and program outcomes for AY 2018. The ESU/Department of Nursing's Assessment program includes the Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP), Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Report

(SLOAP-R), and the Kansas State Board of Nursing Systematic Evaluation Plan (K-SEP). All criterion in the ESU Department of Nursing Assessment Program adhere to best practice standards (HLC, ACEN, KSBN, QSEN, AACN Essentials, NPSS, etc...). This past year (AY 2018) the EDN implemented a Student Success Center (SSC) to assist with early remediation for students needing individual student learning plans (I-SLIPS) to facilitate attainment of student learning outcomes as measured and monitored in our SEP/SLOAP-R. The SSC was very well received and plans are to continue the program next year. Students develop an individualized portfolio to track their individual assessment needs again through each level of the program.

Annually and throughout this past academic year formative and summative data was collected for assessment planning and the results are reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations. Data are also aggregated and trended over three-year periods and reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations.

Annually and as needed data are uploaded and reported for review by the Emporia State University Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) for feedback and analysis of the assessment process. All feedback this past academic year on the data outcomes and processes have been positive.

Attached please find the most recent Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Assessment Plan and Outcomes (2013-2017 and 2018). The Assessment Plan includes the Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP) and the Student Learning Assessment Outcome Plan and Report (SLOAP-R) for 2013-2017 and the revised SEP and SLOAP-R for 2018-2019 based on the new 2017 ACEN Standards. These documents outline the Assessment Program, Plans, and Reports for the Department of Nursing this past academic year. Outcomes for 2018-2019 will continue to be monitored through the SEP/SLOAP-R for end-of-program student learning outcomes attainment and program outcomes.

AY 2017

The methodology used by the Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Assessment Program continues to be provided through the framework of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of student learning and program outcomes. The ESU/Department of Nursing's Assessment program includes the Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP), Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Report (SLOAP-R), and the Kansas State Board of Nursing Systematic Evaluation Plan (K-SEP). All criterion in the ESU Department of Nursing Assessment Program adhere to best practice standards (HLC, ACEN, KSBN, QSEN, AACN Essentials, NPSS, etc...). This past year (AY 2017) Emporia State University Department of Nursing underwent a reaccreditation visit from ACEN and a re-approval visit from KSBN and was found in compliance with all six ACEN standards with no recommendations for approval. The accreditation timeline granted was the maximum of 8 years. KSBN granted re-approval also for the maximum period of the accreditation cycle.

Annually and throughout each academic year formative and summative data are collected for assessment planning and the results are reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations. Data are also aggregated and trended over three-year periods and reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations.

Annually and as needed data are uploaded and reported for review by the Emporia State University Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) for feedback and analysis of the assessment process.

Attached please find the most recent Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Assessment Plan and Outcomes. The Assessment Plan includes the Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP) and the Student Learning Assessment Outcome Plan and Report (SLOAP-R) for 2013-2017. These documents outline the Assessment Program, Plans, and Reports for the Department of Nursing this past academic year.

AY 2016

The methodology used by the Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Assessment Program continues to be provided through the framework of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of student learning and program outcomes. The ESU/Department of Nursing's Assessment program includes the Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP), Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Report (SLOAP-R), and the Kansas State Board of Nursing Systematic Evaluation Plan (K-SEP). All criterion in the ESU Department of Nursing Assessment Program adhere to best practice standards (HLC, ACEN, KSBN, QSEN, AACN Essentials, NPSS, etc...)

Annually and throughout each academic year formative and summative data are collected for assessment planning and the results are reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations. Data are also aggregated and trended over three year periods and reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations.

Annually and as needed data are uploaded and reported for review by the Emporia State University Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) for feedback and analysis of the assessment process.

Attached please find the most recent Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Self Study Report prepared for the scheduled reaccreditation visit by ACEN, October 4,5,and 6, 2016; the Self Evaluation Report prepared for KSBN for the re-approval visit schedule October 4, 5, and 6, 2016; the Systematic Evaluation Plan and Student Learning Assessment Outcome Plan and Report (SLOAP-R) for

2013-2016; outlining the Assessment Program, Plans, and Reports for the Department of Nursing this past academic year.

AY 2015

The methodology used by the Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Assessment Program is provided through the framework of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) of student learning and program outcomes. The ESU/Department of Nursing's Assessment program includes the Systematic Evaluation Plan (SEP), Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Report (SLOAP-R), and the Kansas State Board of Nursing Systematic Evaluation Plan (K-SEP). All criterion in the ESU Department of Nursing Assessment Program adhere to best practice standards (HLC, ACEN, KSBN, QSEN, AACN Essentials, NPSS, etc....)

Annually and throughout each academic year formative and summative data are collected for assessment planning and the results are reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations. Data are also aggregated and trended over three year periods and reported to the Faculty Organization for actions and recommendations.

Annually and as needed data are uploaded and reported for review by the Emporia State University Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) for feedback and analysis of the assessment process. Attached please find the most recent Emporia State University Department of Nursing's Assessment Program Plans and Reports.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - NURSING 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - NURSING 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - NURSING 2014](#)
- [Nur-Senior-Survey-UG-FA2016-SP2017-SU2017-Grads \(14\)](#)
- [LAS-NURSING-BSN](#)
- [Assessment Results and Report 2015 based on 2014 data](#)
- [ATI Aggregated Trend Data total and subscale scores](#)
- [ESU Department of Nursing Assessment Program](#)
- [PASL Report 2014](#)
- [Systematic Eval Plan and Report - 2014-2017](#)
- [FINAL Emporia State University ACEN Self Study Report](#)
- [Systematic Eval Plan and Report SSR FINAL 8_12_2016docx](#)
- [KSBN Self Evaluation](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - NURSING 2017](#)
- [May 2018 Systematic Eval Plan and SLOAP-R WITH NEW 2017 ACEN Standards.docx](#)
- [Systematic Eval Plan and Report Academic Year 2017 - Final law.docx](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Nursing - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - NURSING 2018](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The Department of Nursing continues to set the standards of excellence in assessment and evaluation planning and practices. The adaptations you have made in the draft "Systematic Evaluation Plan and Report" for 2018 by aligning with the newly updated ACEN standards are proactive and forward-thinking. The opening of the Student Success Center and the Individual Student Learning Plans provide some exact changes that will directly relate to keeping students at expected performance levels for nursing majors. Identifying those areas of extra emphasis, whether it be content knowledge or practical application skills, is one of the most effective and positive educational practices I've seen applied to confirm positive and exact progression through a curriculum. The department faculty's approach to team teaching and collaborative partnering in developing, adapting, and refining the curriculum is commendable. The faculty's ability to evaluate student learning, identify change strategies, and positively affect change within courses and across the program's curriculum is evident in all of the student success metric scores and their success on the NCLEX exam. It is exciting to see that the Nursing program is planning to expand its offerings. I'm encouraged to see exactly how these awesome assessment practices will manifest in the new programs. Your leadership and the commitments of the faculty are a great asset to the university, you are at the top of the mountain, the best of the assessment best!

Academic Year 2017

This past academic year (AY 2017) has demonstrated evidence that the current assessment plan and program (SEP, SLOAP-R) is supporting excellent outcomes for the Department of Nursing. This past year as previously mentioned (AY 2017) the Emporia State University Department of Nursing underwent a reaccreditation visit from the Accreditation Commission on Education for Nursing (ACEN) and a re-

approval visit from the Kansas State Board of Nursing (KSBN) and was found in compliance with all six ACEN standards with no recommendations for approval. The accreditation timeline granted was the maximum of 8 years. KSBN granted re-approval also for the maximum period of the accreditation cycle. The SEP and SLOAP-R received no recommendations for improvement within the department by the ACEN or KSBN visitors. This is excellent verification that the EDN's assessment program is strong and providing the type of ongoing assessment evidence needed. The department of Nursing continues to promote and evidence a continuous high quality assessment program that exceeds expectations in every category. The graduates of this program evidence the quality of the student learning experience and the assessment practices ensure the sustainability of the department. Excellent Assessment Practices!!!

Academic Year 2016

As the Department of Nursing prepares for its October 2016 reaccreditation visit, it is with the utmost confidence that the assessment program in place is legitimate in every way. The ACEN Self-Study Report and Systematic Evaluation Plan and Report provide an extensive review of every operational function of the department. The reports provide evidence of the structural integrity of the program including the curricular, practical, and environmental contexts. The reports provide supporting evidence of the success of Nursing graduates, the ability of the department to adapt to changes in the environment, and to the medical profession requirements in general. Overall, the quality of the Department of Nursing is evidenced in the assessment documents provided in the file repository which support the rich and elaborate assessments of student learning competencies. An outstanding model of organizing, measuring, and confirming student learning across all of the program learning goals. GREAT ASSESSMENT WORK!

Academic Year 2015 The Nursing program has a highly structured assessment program that has served them well for many years. There is a reason why the program is the top ranked Nursing program in the State of Kansas. The adaptations to the assessment plan over time has allowed for curricular changes and approaches to preparation for Licensure examinations. The NCLEX test scores and success of program graduates are confirming outcomes that the assessment program is well designed and effective. Some of the challenges and opportunities that will occur over the next few years are tied to changes in specialized accreditation requirements. It will be interesting to see how the Nursing program adapts to these changes. Overall, there is a very comprehensive and effective assessment plan in place that is navigating the changes of the discipline with precision. Stay current with new requirements and adapt as necessary, and keep up the excellent assessment work!

Providing Department: Nursing

Responsible Roles: Linda Adams Wendling (E10087892), Mary Mitsui (E10000083)

UNIT REPORT

Physical Sciences Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:08 AM

**Physical Sciences Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

The curricular maps will be updated for each of the areas (chemistry, earth science and physics) to integrate BA, BS and BSE degrees. In addition, a regular rotation of assessment has been created and shared with faculty to continue assessment of each of the programs including extended course embedded assessment practices as a component of the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plans.

AY 2017**Department level student learning improvement plan**

We have uploaded syllabi from the Department of Physical Sciences, including student learning outcomes on the syllabi. In addition, we have completed curriculum maps for each of the programs in the department. In continuation, we will be documenting assessment of student learning in each of the general education courses offered by the Department of Physical Sciences. For those faculty who are not instructors of gen ed courses, assessment of courses in their program will be assessed. To this end, the goal is that every faculty member contributes to the overall assessment goals, whether general education or program-specific.

AY 2016**Department level student learning improvement plan**

Syllabi for all Fall 2015/Spring 2016 courses have been updated with student learning outcomes. In addition, the Department completed curriculum maps for each of the programs, both undergraduate and graduate. The goal of the next academic year will be to address the discontinuities between course outcomes and program goals. Notably, faculty will develop assessment cycles.

AY 2015**Department level student learning improvement plan**

1. In the fall of 2015, the faculty of the Department of Physical Science aims to determine the learning goals of the programs. With the learning goals (department and program), the curriculum maps of the programs will be created.
2. The learning improvement strategy will depend on the learning goals of the programs. After declaring the goals, the faculty can begin to assess the programs. For the last few years, there has been a global lack of an assessment plan as the system has changed from a PASL (program assessment of student learning) format to the new integration with CampusLabs.
3. The cycle of assessment has been absent for many years. To develop a meaningful plan, all faculty will be encouraged to participate in an approach that adds value to student learning.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

The department has transitioned all applicable programs to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans including integrating the faculty reporting of assigned courses identified for assessment in year 2 of the plans. This was a complex endeavor considering the number of programs in the department. In addition, the BSE programs were all under review by the Kansas Department of Education and the reporting for these assessments was completed in October 2017. All of the KSDE files are uploaded in the file libraries for the affiliated

program assessment plans. In addition, the course level student learning outcomes assessments reported by faculty are uploaded in the respective program assessment plans. The changes implemented in these courses along with the improvement strategies for student learning in the KSDE reports highlight a very productive year for assessment practices in the department. The plan is to build on this momentum and also incorporate some professional development activities for faculty.

AY 2017

The strategy is to provide examples of assessment from colleagues in other departments. Then, instructors will choose their assessment strategy for a singular course they teach this academic year.

AY 2016

The Department updated syllabi to contain learning outcomes and completed curriculum maps for each program. With the curriculum maps serving as a foundation, the next step is to identify assessment strategies.

AY 2015

It was determined with a review of assessment activity over the past year, those efforts centered mainly on the criteria and standards covered within those programs under the direction of the Kansas Department of Education and standards adopted for Science(s) teachers. In addition to this most important work, the chemistry faculty engaged in assessment of students prior academic preparation and success in Chemistry I and Chemistry II courses. These findings resulted in a faculty senate approved change to the curriculum regarding prerequisites in math course completion and related ACT sub-scores in mathematics and science reasoning prior to enrollment in Chemistry I and II courses.

Completion of the curriculum mapping exercises will lead assessment efforts in the future as the Physical Sciences department infuses assessment to improve student learning throughout its curricula.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - PHYSICAL SCIENCES 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PHYSICAL SCIENCES 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PHYSICAL SCIENCES 2014](#)
- [PHYSCI_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [PhySci-Senior-Survey-UG-FA2016-SP2017-SU2017-Grads](#)
- [DNBROWN_CH123_ACS_ExamScores_F12](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEM AND MATH - 2015 Spring Analyses](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEM I LAB](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEM II](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEM II LAB](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEMCOURSES_1-22-13_200750-201250](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEMISTRY I ALL](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEMISTRY I ALL with math](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEMISTRY I update](#)
- [DNBROWN_CHEMISTRY I update](#)
- [DNBROWN_chemistry_math_1-22-2013](#)
- [DNBROWN_chemistry_math_1-22-2013X](#)
- [DNBROWN_STUDENT_CHARACTERISTICS_W_SCORES_1-25-13](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PHYSICAL SCIENCES 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Physical Sciences - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PHYSICAL SCIENCES 2018](#)

Program Name: Chemistry BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Note: the Chemistry BS/BA/BSE assessment reporting will transition to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan beginning in AY 2018. After completing the curricular map for the chemistry program (BA/BS/BSE), each of the faculty chose one course to assess student learning outcomes. Assessment was provided by all tenure-track or tenured faculty including Dr. Claudia Aguirre-Mendez, Dr. Diane Nutbrown, Dr. Carlos Peroza, Dr. Kim Simons, Dr. Eric Trump, and Dr. Qiyang Zhang.

Faculty identified the approach of assessment for the single course during the 2016-2017 academic year. The only emphasis was to assess a general education course. For the chemistry program, there is no *bona fide* general education course. General chemistry and chemistry I

fulfill the physical-science general-education requirement.

Overall, the evidence provides a good starting place for program-wide assessment. The faculty had covered the chemistry program goals (see curriculum map). The recommendation is to continue this process with assessment conducted each semester by each instructor, to develop an assessment strategy that covers each program goal and course, and to provide justification on why a student learning objective was chosen and why changes were made. For each evidence of assessment, constructive feedback is provided (see below) in the assessment recommendation.

The American Chemical Society (ACS) Committee on Professional Training (CPT) provides accreditation to the B.S. Chemistry program. The 2016 annual program for ACS-CPT is attached.

Evidence of assessment

CH 120 Spring 2017 Dr. Claudia Aguirre-Mendez (74 students)

Student learning objective: Acquire proficiency in core skills for academic success, demonstrate effective communication skills, mathematical skills, and IT skills.

Measurement: I created a writing prompt in which student needed to answer a testable question and provide their claims and evidence. In summary, they created argumentative text about chemistry concepts. The teaching assistants were trained to grade using a rubric. The purpose of this assessment was to promote understanding of chemistry, to understand of scientific argumentation, to connect the concept with real world application and using computer simulations. The results indicate that students developed an understanding of the argumentative concepts over time. Students were able to analyze qualitative and quantitative data using simulation, creating tables and graphs. The results also indicate that students were able to write scientific claims accurate and also understood the power of generating a claim. Most of the students clearly develop their scientific writing skills. They showed growth from 85% (first writing sample) to 88% (last writing sample). The result also indicate that still there is small proportion of students who still need to improve how to write an argument. The main problem is that students think that evidence is only data and that data speaks by itself. In the table below a summary table of the data:

Writing Sample	W1 28 points	W2 12 points	W3 36 points	W4 37 points	Participants	Total writing samples
Average	23.77	9.62	31.83	32.54		
Percent Average	85	80	86	88		
					N=74	296

Future plans: I plan to provide a more efficient feedback and explain to students with examples what was missing in their writing assignments.

Assessment recommendation: How will better feedback be provided, especially when the writing is graded by a teaching assistant? If you have already shown writing examples, how will more examples help?

Some students did not come to my office hours to see their writing samples. Implementing the plan that I am proposing will allow me to spend 5 minutes of my class showing them a summary of common issues in their writing. In addition during those five minute I also plan to show students the examples of effective argumentative writing from their peers without showing names.

CH 123 Chemistry I Spring 2017 Dr. Diane Nutbrown (56 students)

Student learning objective: demonstrate knowledge of concepts.

Measurement: We used the American Chemical Society First-Term General Chemistry 2015 standardized test as the final exam for CH 123. National norms are still being established and will be communicated by the ACS Exams Institute once compiled. Preliminary national data may be viewed at <http://uwmm.edu/acs-exams/exams-that-need-norming/>. We administered this test in Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 for all sections of Chemistry I. Data in Spring 2017 was recorded in such a way that items may be grouped by concept and student mastery of those concepts tracked from one semester to the next. In Fall 2016, only the total raw score on the test was recorded for each student, which does not allow us to target a particular concept. The test has 70 items. The high score for Spring 2017 was 53, the low was 16, and the average was 36.8 (N = 34; 4 students did not take the test and were not included in stats or N). Compiling all three sections of CH 123 in Fall 2016, the high score was 63, the low was 12, and the average was 39.2 (N = 56; 8 enrolled students did not take the exam)

Future plans: Based on data from Spring 2017, we can identify areas of weakness among our students and select a concept to target in the Fall 2016 semester for additional or modified instruction. The ACS exam will be given as the final, again, and we can track performance on related test items to determine if the modified instruction made a measurable difference in student learning outcomes.

Assessment recommendation: The future plans need to be more definitive. Rather than “can”, “will”. Also, what thresholds will be used to identify concepts that need better instruction?

CH 779 Advanced Instrumental Analysis Spring 2017 Dr. Carlos Peroza (15 students)

Student learning objective: Describe and understand the purpose of common instrumental components.

Measurement: The following questions were asked during the final exam:

1. Explain how capillary gel electrophoresis works in analyzing DNA fragments, (DNA analysis or genotyping) (9/15 = 60%) were able to answer the question satisfactorily.
2. Describe how an EI source forms ions from analyte molecules. Is this a hard or soft ionization source? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this source? (13/15 = 87%) were able to answer the question satisfactorily.
3. Diagram a simple TOF mass spectrometer and explain how mass separation is achieved in a TOF mass analyzer. (11/15 = 74%) were able to answer the question satisfactorily.

Future: I am planning to work on in-class exercises with diagrams were they identify each component of the instrument and explain the purpose of it.

Assessment recommendation: Why do you plan on doing in-class exercises? Were the student scores not acceptable? Were these instruments not explained in class last year (you mentioned explaining the purpose of the diagrams)?

CH 662 Biochemistry II Spring 2017 Dr. Kim Simons (15 students)

Student learning objective(s): Analyze experimental evidence supporting the current understanding of metabolism. Investigate the connection between aberrant metabolism and human disease.

Measurement: Writing assignments were measured. In the past, students submitted one large report at the end of the semester. To provide more feedback, several small writing assignments were assigned and due over the course of the semester. The idea was to improve student writing, provide an opportunity to read current research papers, and to connect their understanding from lecture to modern research issues. Students were given a rubric. After reviewing the scores from the first paper, there are noticeable improvements from an initial paper average of 3.9 to final paper average of 4.1 (of 5.0 total points). Overall, students had better grammar (mechanics) and critique scores. The 20% improvement over the course of the semester was still undermined by some students doing poorly.

Future Plans: I will continue using shorter papers rather than one large paper. I would like to give the students practice editing their papers to understand their mistakes. As determined by a student poll I conducted mid-semester, the writing center at ESU was not very helpful since the concepts were very “scientific”.

Assessment recommendation: Determine how to apply a model of student edits that is not burdensome.

CH 575 Organic Chemistry II Lab Spring 2017 Dr. Eric Trump (26 students)

Student learning objective(s): Stoichiometry, limiting reactant, and calculating percent yield.

Measurement: A written worksheet was provided in which the students calculated the amount of a chemical compound, using grams to moles and moles to grams calculations, needed to react with another compound completely. There were other problems that involved determining the limiting reagent and determining percent yield. There were no quantitative measures used, but it was observed that the students had difficulty with these concepts based on the question asked and the time that it took to complete the assignment.

Future Plans: Short quizzes that assess these learning objectives will be given early in the semester and then during the last part of the semester.

Assessment recommendation: how much time was required for the students to answer the question? What is an acceptable amount of time? How many students had difficulty? In the future, identify how many students are struggling with this concept and identify a means of better instruction. Then, student learning can be re-evaluated following the changes to see if instruction improved performance.

CH 376 Quantitative Analysis Fall 2016 Dr. Qiyang Zhang (15 students)

Student learning objective(s): To improve problem-solving skills, including identifying a problem, developing a problem-solving strategy, and implementing that strategy successfully.

Measurement: Through this semester, many problem-solving skills have been taught during the lecture. These skills are very useful in learning core topics of quantitative analysis, such as chemical equilibrium, titration, etc. Students learned problem-solving skills in the class and practiced during homework and quiz. Chemical equilibrium is one of the major concepts in this class. At the beginning of the semester, most students have no idea about equilibrium and the equilibrium constant. After chapter 6, many students know how to write an expression of equilibrium constant for a given chemical reaction. At the end of that semester, several questions require students to perform equilibrium-related calculations to find correct answers. This shows students have the ability to identify the question and apply problem-solving skills to answer the question.

Future Plans: I plan to compare their scores for equilibrium-related questions from the beginning to the end of the semester. I will give students more calculation demonstration and practice in the class.

Assessment recommendation: the statement is made that students "have no idea about equilibrium and the equilibrium constant" which is distressing given that these concepts are emphasized in chemistry II (CH 126, a pre-requisite for this course). Determine a means of measuring how many students struggle with these concepts and identify at what level they do not understand. One issue to probe is to see how well students understand these concepts as measured by the ACS exam at the end of chemistry II. Then, to measure their abilities in a pre-quiz during the start of this course (similar difficulty questions but not the same questions from the ACS exam).

AY 2016

The curriculum map in the file library illustrates an approach towards program assessment. The learning outcomes are collected from syllabi and are mapped to program goals. As evidenced by the map, the sum of courses in the program are addressing all the program goals.

Attached Files

[ACS 2016 Program Review](#)

[LAS-PS-CHEMISTRY-BS](#)

[ACS American Chemistry Society Approval Letter for Accreditation](#)

[ACS Annual Report 2017 - Chemistry - Physical Sciences](#)

Program Name: Chemistry BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

See updates in the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Plan for Chemistry BS/BA/BSE

AY 2017

See attached documentation for KSDE reporting. The KSDE report for the Chemistry BSE program shows that program completers are meeting all of the required standards to successfully obtain teaching certifications and that a small number may not complete the program or change major discipline of study. Strategies to improve student learning (KSDE Report Section V) were related to greater professional engagement, improving communication of assessment results among faculty and candidates that would improve student performance on content assessments, and modifying curriculum, instruction, and assessment strategies in first-year courses. In addition, improving student efficiencies at passing the Praxis II Chemistry Content Tests on the first attempt was considered valuable and strategies to determine best times to test and increased focus on chemistry content test preparation were deemed important. These strategies align with coordinating course assessments across the BA/BS/BSE program to maximize effectiveness in improving student learning.

AY 2016

Reporting will be available in October of 2016 and files will be uploaded accordingly. The curriculum map for the Chemistry BS represents common courses for the BSE program with the exception of some education methods and teaching courses that are part of The Teachers College curriculum. Thus, the curriculum map for the Chemistry BS program is presented in the file library for the BSE program as well.

AY 2015

Information about chemistry BSE assessment is contained in the KSDE report, the most recent from 2013. The changes from the KSDE are still in progress and an updated report will be uploaded when it becomes available. For now the most recent report is included in the evidence files. Section V is dedicated to use of assessment results to improve candidate and program performance. The Conceptual Framework (CF) identifies six proficiencies that are developed to reach a level of competency characterized as being The Professional. This vision of being The Professional is based on providing service to society, applying interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, engaging in effective practice, responding to uncertainty and change, relying on self-reflection, and belonging to a professional community. The chemistry teacher education program of studies is designed to provide opportunities for chemistry candidates to develop their knowledge,

skills, and dispositions to become professional educators. For the vision to become more than simply words on paper, data from useful assessments need to be analyzed. The analyses need to produce actions, and the actions need to produce positive results that improve candidate performance and strengthen the chemistry teacher education program of studies. Among faculty, there is a sense of satisfaction that 80% or more of the chemistry candidates admitted to teacher education progress through the program and successfully complete all program requirements. Most frequently, candidates admitted to teacher education who do not complete all program requirements elect to pursue other non-teaching majors. Infrequently, a candidate may be unsuccessful in completing one or more program requirements and leave the university or pursue other education and career options. As a generalization, the performance of chemistry candidates may be characterized as "average" on both national assessments (e. g., Praxis II content and Praxis II PLT) when compared to test takers nation-wide and on ESU developed assessments (e. g., Teacher Work Sample) when compared to other ESU test takers. Historically, chemistry candidate performance on the Student Teacher Assessment, as evaluated by cooperating teachers, most often results in the chemistry candidates receiving a grade of "A" but some occasionally earn a "B." On Departments of Physical Sciences developed assessments (e. g., PS430 Nature of Science Project and PS430 Nature of Science Test), chemistry candidates' performances can be characterized as average to above average. With the relatively small number of chemistry candidates, caution is advised when making generalizations and when comparing groups. Despite this cautionary note, Emporia State University strives to take actions that will elevate the performances of candidates and improve the chemistry teacher education program. Rather than attempting to pursue or suggest a myriad of actions that by their number could lead to a lack of follow-through and success, efforts will focus on a few actions to elevate chemistry candidate performance and improve the program.

1. One action taken since 2010 intended to elevate students' performances in the chemistry teacher education program has been to encourage chemistry candidates to serve as departmental student assistants, tutors, etc. in either paid or unpaid capacities and be active in student organizations such as the Emporia State University National Science Teachers Association Student Chapter and the student organization affiliated with the American Chemical Society. Serving in these capacities or similar roles represent a stage in the transition from student to student teacher to chemistry teacher and professional educator. Increased responsibilities have the potential to improve chemistry candidates' content knowledge (e. g., deeper thinking required when considering students' questions) and instructional skills (e. g., responding to individual student questions). Of the seven 2010-2013 candidates, six held student assistant positions (Note: funding can affect positions available). The seventh has experience as a tutor. One candidate served as a workshop assistant in a summer workshop designed for science teachers. Being a member of a student organization with the opportunity to attend professional conferences has the potential to cause students to begin the transition from student to teacher, and eventually to professional educator. Five of the seven candidates held officer positions in one or more student organizations. The departmental goal is to involve as many students as possible with the predicted result for candidates being demonstrable improvement in their content knowledge and professionalism.
2. A second action proposed in 2010 was to increase communication of assessment results among faculty and among students. Faculty are involved in assessment of chemistry candidates' levels of achievement of various standards. They are given the opportunity to rate candidates on the candidates' achievement of selected standards. The Physical Sciences Education Coordinator compiles data and ultimately is responsible for submitting reports. Candidates must receive departmental approval to proceed to Phase 2, student teaching. Discussion of chemistry candidates' strengths and weaknesses occurs at a departmental meeting prior to the department vote that approves or denies admission to Phase 2.
3. It was proposed in 2010 that greater communication of assessment results would be provided to chemistry candidates. At best, this effort can be characterized as having mixed results. In PS430 Nature of Science chemistry candidates receive feedback on some, but not all, chemistry standards. In 2010 it was suggested that as assessment data are compiled, such data could be shared with chemistry candidates. This has proven to be too costly with regard to time for it to have been accomplished. Some grouped data have been shared with a few members of the ESU National Science Teachers Association Student Chapter. The hope was that with greater candidate and faculty awareness of standards and the role of assessments in providing evidence of their achievement, more focused candidate performance would lead to improved candidate performance on content assessments. Another predicted change was faculty focusing on strategies to improve student performance in assessed areas, e. g., modification of curriculum, instruction, or assessment strategies. Critical courses most likely to be affected are the first-year courses, i. e., Chemistry I and Lab and Chemistry II and Lab.
4. For whatever reason, there seems to be a comfort level with the assessments developed locally, but a greater concern for one of the the national assessments. Perhaps this concern is fueled because of the issue of "control." National assessments are beyond the control of faculty at ESU. Praxis II PLT results are not a concern. Praxis II Chemistry Content Test results are somewhat of a concern. All chemistry program completers achieve passing scores. Actions are being considered, and some have been taken to improve the "efficiency" of chemistry test takers, i. e., improve the percentage of chemistry test takers who pass on the first attempt. Actions proposed or undertaken include:
 - a. Through advising, increase awareness of the need to focus on chemistry content test preparation as starting at enrollment and not as "last minute" preparation.
 - b. Through advising, identify a "best" time to take the chemistry content test. Sometimes financial considerations dictate when candidates take their tests. Others have a significant time lapse between completion of certain chemistry courses and taking the test or they attempt the test (and others) during student teaching. Individual circumstances should be considered to identify a best time for test completion.
 - c. Improve test preparation by increasing awareness of chemistry test topics and testing conditions by directing both students and faculty to online and paper sources of information provided by Educational Testing Services (ETS).
 - d. Analyze course content for areas where candidates score low and review those components of the course. With the actions listed above, a predicted result is improved candidate learning that will produce improved performance on the Praxis tests. ESU faculty are resolved to elevate chemistry candidates' performances and improve the chemistry teacher education program. The self-study and critical review by outside professionals that occur as part of the accreditation process play an

important role in achieving the goals of continuous improvement and development of chemistry candidates as professionals.

Attached Files

- [ERS AY 2017](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables \(final\) Chemistry Praxis II and PLT 1314 1415 1516](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table \(final\) Chem TWS 1-4 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table \(final\) ST Chem 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table \(final\) Chem TWS 5-7 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 5 Chem Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Chem Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 6 Chem Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table Chem Stds 1, 2, 3](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table Chem Stds 5, 6, 7 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 Chem Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2016](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table Chemistry KPTP Tasks 1-Context](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Chemistry KPTP Tasks 3](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables \(final\) Chemistry Praxis II and PLT 1415 1516 1617](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table Chemistry TWS 1-4 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ST Chemistry 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Chemistry TWS 5-7 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 5 Chemistry Scoring Guide summer 2017](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Chem Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables Chemistry Praxis II and PLT 2007-2014](#)
- [Assess 2 Chem Rubric](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table Chem TWS 1-4 2007-2014](#)
- [Assess 5 Chem Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Chem Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 2007-2014](#)
- [Assess 6 Chem Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 6 Chem Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table Chem Stds 1, 2, 3](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table Chem Stds 5, 6, 7 2016-2017](#)
- [Assess 8 Chemistry Inq Safe Data Table 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table Chem Stds 5, 6, 7 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 Chem Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2013](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric](#)
- [chem BSE Mar. 2013 PASL](#)
- [Chemistry KSDE Report-1011,1112,1213](#)
- [Chem Template 2017](#)
- [LAS-PS-CHEMISTRY-BS-BSE](#)

Program Name: Earth and Space Sciences BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Note: the Earth and Space Sciences BSE assessment reporting will transition to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan beginning in AY 2018. Assessment was provided through KSDE accreditation (See attached files). The findings of the assessment of the program resulted in greater flexibility for candidates to select earth-science based courses, and in requiring a meteorology course and an astronomy/space science course provides more in-depth coverage of topics in disciplines specifically addressed by standards. Sharing assessment results and dedicating change strategies to curriculum, teaching, and improved communication among students and faculty

relating to the complexity in achieving certification as Earth and Space Science teachers and with improving performance on licensure tests.

AY 2016

The curriculum map for BSE Earth Science was completed and is being used to create an assessment plan for this academic year. The Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) provides expectations for assessing and reporting all teacher education preparation programs. In addition, CAEP requirements are implemented into the assessment of these programs as well. The KSDE is in the process of updating its reporting templates including some new standards. As the Earth and Space Sciences program adapts to these new standards, the reporting and data tables are uploaded into the file repository.

AY 2015

The Conceptual Framework (CF) identifies six competencies; that are developed to reach a level of competency characterized as being The Professional. This vision of being The Professional is based on providing service to society, applying interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, engaging in effective practice, responding to uncertainty and change, relying on self-reflection, and belonging to a professional community. The earth and space science teacher education program of studies is designed to provide opportunities for earth and space science candidates to develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to become professional educators. For the vision to become more than simply words on paper, data from useful assessments need to be analyzed. The analyses need to produce actions, and the actions need to produce positive results that improve candidate performance and strengthen the earth and space science teacher education program of studies.

Among faculty, there is a sense of satisfaction that 80% or more of the earth and space science candidates admitted to teacher education progress through the program and successfully complete all program requirements. Most frequently, candidates admitted to teacher education who do not complete all program requirements elect to pursue other non-teaching majors. Infrequently, a candidate may be unsuccessful in completing one or more program requirements and leave the university or pursue other education and career options. As a generalization, the performance of earth and space science candidates may be characterized as "average" on both national assessments (e. g., Praxis II content and Praxis II PLT) when compared to test takers nation-wide and on ESU developed assessments (e. g., Teacher Work Sample) when compared to other ESU test takers. Historically, earth and space science candidates' performances on the Student Teacher Assessment, as evaluated by cooperating teachers, often results in the earth and space science candidates receiving grades of "A." Five of five 2010-2013 candidates' total scores placed them in the A grade. On Departments of Physical Sciences developed assessments (e. g., PS430 Nature of Science Project and PS430 Nature of Science Test), earth and space science candidates' performances can be characterized as average to above average.

With the relatively small number of earth and space science candidates, caution is advised when making generalizations and when comparing groups. Despite this cautionary note, Emporia State University strives to take actions that will elevate the performances of candidates and improve the earth and space science teacher education program. Rather than attempting to pursue or suggest a myriad of actions that by their number could lead to a lack of follow-through and success, efforts will focus on a few actions to elevate earth and space science candidates' performances and improve the program.

1. One action taken since 2010 intended to elevate students' performances and improve the earth and space science teacher education program has been to encourage earth and space science candidates to serve as departmental student assistants, tutors, etc. in either a paid or unpaid capacities and be active in student organizations such as the Emporia State University National Science Teachers Association Student Chapter or the Earth Science Club. Serving in these capacities or similar roles represent a stage in the transition from student to student teacher to earth science teacher and professional educator. Increased responsibilities have the potential to improve earth and space science candidates' content knowledge (e. g., deeper thinking required when considering students' questions) and instructional skills (e. g., responding to individual student questions). Of the five 2010-2013 candidates, two held student assistant positions (Note: funding has affected opportunities available), two others were employed by the university or local school district in positions of responsibility, and the final candidate served as a tutor. Being a member of a student organization with the opportunity to attend professional conferences has the potential to cause candidates to begin the transition from student to teacher, and eventually, professional educator. Two of the five candidates held officer positions in one or more student organizations. The departmental goal is to involve as many students as possible with the predicted result for candidates being demonstrable improvement in their content knowledge and professionalism.
2. A second action proposed in 2010 was to increase communication of assessment results among faculty and among candidates. Faculty are involved in assessment of earth and space science candidates' levels of achievement of various standards. They are given the opportunity to rate candidates on their achievement of selected standards. The Physical Sciences Education Coordinator compiles data and ultimately is responsible for submitting reports. Candidates must receive departmental approval to proceed to Phase 2, student teaching. Discussion of candidates' strengths and weaknesses occurs at a departmental meeting prior to the department vote that approves or denies admission to Phase 2.
3. It was proposed in 2010 that greater communication of assessment results would be provided to earth and space science candidates. At

best, this effort can be characterized as having mixed results. In PS430 Nature of Science, earth and space science candidates receive feedback on some, but not all, earth and space science standards. In 2010, it was suggested that as assessment data are compiled, such data could be shared with earth and space science candidates. This has proven to be too costly with regard to time for it to have been accomplished. Some grouped data have been shared with a few members of the ESU National Science Teachers Association Student Chapter. The hope was that with greater candidate and faculty awareness of standards and the role of assessments in providing evidence of their achievement, more focused candidate performance would lead to improved candidate performance on assessments. Another predicted change was faculty focusing on strategies to improve student performance in assessed areas, e. g., modification of curriculum, instruction, or assessment strategies. Critical courses most likely to be affected are the first year courses such as Introduction to Earth Science and Lab. A change in the required set of courses has been suggested and is moving through the course approval/program approval system. One change provides students with more flexibility with regard to field courses. Candidates will have the option to take GO 547 Field Geology (5 cr.; the "old" requirement) or five credits of other approved field courses. A second change is that instead of five credits of approved electives candidates will take astronomy or space science and meteorology. These designated courses are intended to provide additional contact background in two major discipline areas of earth and space science.

4. For whatever reason, there seems to be a comfort level with the assessments developed locally, but a greater concern for one of the the national assessments. Perhaps this concern is fueled because of the issue of "control." National assessments are beyond the control of faculty at ESU. Praxis II PLT results are not a concern. Praxis II Earth and Space Science Content Test results are somewhat of a concern. All earth and space science program completers achieve passing scores. No 2010-2013 program completers needed to take the content test more than once. Actions have been taken to previously improve the "efficiency" and now maintain the efficiency of earth and space science test takers, i.e., pass on the first attempt, and improve the total scores of earth and space science test takers. Actions proposed or undertaken have included:

- a. Through advising, increase awareness of the need to focus on earth and space science content test preparation as starting at enrollment and not as "last minute" preparation.
- b. Through advising, identify a "best" time to take the earth and space science content test. Sometimes financial considerations dictate when candidates take their tests. Others have a significant time lapse between completion of certain earth and space science courses and taking the test, or they attempt the test (and others) during student teaching. Individual circumstances should be considered to identify a best time for test completion.
- c. Improve test preparation by increasing awareness of earth and space science test topics and testing conditions by directing both students and faculty to online and paper sources of information provided by Educational Testing Services (ETS).
- d. Analyze course content for areas where candidates score low and review those components of the course.

With the actions listed above, a predicted result is improved candidate learning that will produce improved performance on the Praxis tests.

ESU faculty are resolved to elevate earth and space science candidates' performances and improve the earth and space science teacher education program. The self-study and critical review by outside professionals that occur as part of the accreditation process play an important role in achieving the goals of continuous improvement and development of earth and space science candidates as professionals.

Attached Files

- [Assess 1 Data Tables for ESS Praxis II Content and PLT 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table ES TWS 1-4 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ES ST 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table ES TWS 5-7 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table ESS Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 6 ES Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table ESS Stds 6, 7, 8 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 ESS Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2016](#)
- [Assessment 2 ES Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 4 ES Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 5 ES Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table ESS Stds 1-4 KS Ed 2010-2016](#)
- [Assessment 8 ES Rubric](#)
- [CHEM Assessment Report Trump](#)

- [Assess 4 Data Table ES TWS 5-7 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table ESS Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 6 ES Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table ESS Stds 6, 7, 8 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 ESS Inq Safe Data Table 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 2 ES Rubric TWS 1-4](#)
- [Assessment 4 ES Rubric TWS 5-7](#)
- [Assessment 5 ES Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table ESS Stds 1-4 KS Ed 2014-2017](#)
- [Assessment 8 ES Rubric](#)
- [Summer 2017 EarthSpaceSci Template2015_OldStandards](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables for ESS Praxis II Content and PLT 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table ES KPTP Tasks 1-Context & Lrng Env & 2-Designing Instruct](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table ES TWS 1-4 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ES ST 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table ES KPTP Tasks 3-Tchg & Lrng Env and 4-Refl & Prof](#)
- [LAS-PS-EARTH AND SPACE SCIENCE-BSE](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables for ESS Praxis II Content and PLT 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table ES TWS 1-4 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ES ST 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table ES TWS 5-7 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table ESS Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 6 ES Scoring Guide 1213](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table ESS Stds 6, 7, 8 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 ESS Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2013](#)
- [Assessment 2 ES Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table ESS Stds 1-4 KS Ed 2010-2013](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric](#)
- [EarthSpaceScienceRptF13-1011,1112,1213](#)
- [es March 2013 PASL](#)

Program Name: Earth Science BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Note: the Earth Science BS/BA assessment reporting will transition to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan beginning in AY 2018. After completing the curricular map for the earth science program (BA/BS/BSE), each of the faculty chose one course to assess student learning outcomes. Assessment was provided by Dr. Alivia Allison, Dr. Marcia Schulmeister, and Dr. Richard Sleezer.

Faculty identified the approach of assessment for the single course during the 2016-2017 academic year. The only emphasis was to assess a general education course. In the earth science curriculum, introduction to earth science and laboratory (ES 110/ES 111) fulfill the general education requirement for a physical science course with a laboratory/field experience.

Overall, the evidence provides a good starting place for program-wide assessment. More faculty need to be involved in the process (half the faculty provided assessment data). Part of this is due to a faculty retirement and also, having adjunct faculty who were not involved.

Evidence of assessment

ES 110 Introduction to Earth Science Spring 2017 Dr. Alivia Allison (46 students)

Student learning objective: Think critically and analytically about an issue, an idea, or a problem.

Measurement: I assessed the general education goals stated by evaluating the answers to the following ES 110 lecture exam question: Which of the following statements best describes the process of erosion?

- A) the process by which weathered rocks and mineral particles are removed from one area and transported elsewhere by a mobile agent such as wind, water, or ice
- B) the combined process of leaching, eluviation, and mass wasting
- C) the movement of weathered rock and regolith toward the base of a slope under the force of gravity
- D) the disintegration and decomposition of rocks and minerals in place (in-situ) at the surface

The correct answer is A. Answer B lists two soil formation processes and mass wasting, answer C describes only mass wasting, and answer D describes weathering processes, but not erosion.

Results from assessment of this exam question, Spring 2017: 32 students (out of 46 enrolled) chose letter A: This is the correct answer to this question, suggesting that the process of

erosion was effectively communicated to the majority of students. 0 students chose letter B: No students confused soil formation processes and mass wasting with the process of erosion. 4 students (9%) chose letter C: This suggests that these students have confused the downslope movement of Earth materials due to gravity (mass wasting) with the process of erosion. 10 students chose letter D: This suggests that these students have confused the process of weathering with the process of erosion.

Future plans: The instructional goal for following semesters concerning these topics will be to work to help students more clearly distinguish between the three processes of mass wasting, weathering, and erosion, three Earth science concepts that are often confused for one another. Class demonstrations and lecture will be used to further illustrate these distinct process differences.

Assessment recommendation: None. The measurement and analysis are outstanding examples of learning assessment. It will be interesting to see how the results change with a change of instruction.

ES 110 Introduction to Earth Science Fall 2016 Dr. Marcia Schulmeister (42 students)

Student learning objective: connections among the ideas and perspectives of multiple disciplines.

Measurement: As part of my effort to tie Earth Science concepts to the interests of students from a variety of majors, I have students watch and evaluate a documentary on the Tar Creek mining disaster in SE KS. In past semesters, students have completed the project outside of the regular class period and submitted assignments independently. A set of open-ended questions helped me to assess concepts students did not fully understand and aspects of the material that were relevant to various majors. This assessment allowed a re-design of the exercise to an in-class viewing with a required worksheet. The worksheet questions require students to dig into the technical aspects of the problems (e.g. metals, mining practices, volumes of waste, etc.), while also considering social and economic aspects of the large scale contamination problem.

Future plans: Since I've guided students to answer specific questions about on more quantitative aspects of the problem, I've noticed a higher level of interest and general concern about its impact on humans and environment. Students seem to desire to know more about issues such as the current status of the mine remediation, the numbers of families displaced, numbers of children impacted by lead poisoning, etc. I intend to add a follow-up exercise/discussion session in future course offerings that will allow students to apply basic earth science concepts to a societal, environmental and economic perspective. The goal is to help students develop confidence in using basic earth science knowledge they obtain my class in everyday decision-making they will face in their careers.

Assessment recommendation: It is not clear why the activity was changed from outside class to within class. With the added discussion, determine what the learning objectives will be and how a discussion will strengthen connections among cross-discipline ideas (see student learning objective above). In addition, consider identifying how the changes in instruction could be measured, even if qualitative, so one knows if the changes were worthwhile.

ES 767 Advanced ArcGIS Applications Spring 2017 Dr. Richard Slezzer (6 students)

Student learning objective: acquire proficiency in core skills.

Measurement: To improve the ability of the students to document their procedure when completing an assignment. The idea is that by the end of the class they have a set of procedures, in their own words, that they can refer back to when they are faced with a GIS question. I have found that if they are forced to do this they do not always appreciate it at the time, but later, when they are working professionally, they refer back to their notes and feel that they are better prepared to problem solve with GIS than their colleagues from other universities. I am including two emails from former students that I hope indicate the effectiveness of what I am doing.

From Levi Jaster (ESU M.S. Biology, now Ph.D. candidate at University of Nevada-Reno)

"I came to UNR with the strongest GIS background of the three students on my project, out of most of the grad students in the department really. I think it was mainly the way you taught GIS in the classes I took while working on my MS with Bill Jensen at Emporia and all the time I spent in the GIS lab cursing the programs, the computers, and grad student life in general. Also, your advice on if you know how to use ArcGIS, then keep your mouth shut or everyone will want you to help them was spot on. When our GIS specialist is out of his office, anyone looking for help comes knocking on my door. Oh well, I guess I have learned more from helping them than I've probably taught anyone."

From Jon Coffey (ESU B.S. Earth Science, now M.A. Anthropology at WSU)

"I wanted to say thank you for all the help you provided me along the way. Your classes provided me with a solid foundation on which to grow my education. In particular, your course on ArcGIS provided real examples of how to use the program. I still refer back to several of the lessons when making maps. This was extremely helpful in developing my graduate project- using 19th century maps with satellite and LIDAR imagery, I was able to locate a portion of a hardly known trading trail that crossed south-central Kansas."

Future plans:

Assessment recommendation: this assessment data provides qualitative evidence of student learning outcomes. To make the data more general, consider a purposeful questionnaire distributed to all graduates to determine if the instruction provides the alumni proficiency at their places of employment or future education. To make assessment more uniform in the future, follow the assessment framework by using the assessment survey web link.

AY 2016

The curriculum for the Earth Science BS/BA is common to the curriculum for the BSE program. The curriculum map for BS/BA Earth Science was completed and is being used to create an assessment plan for this academic year which will be aligned with the assessment structure of the BSE program as directed by both the KSDE and the CAEP specialized accreditation.

Attached Files

[LAS-PS-EARTH SCIENCE-BS-BA](#)

Program Name: Science Middle Grades 5-8 Level - BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

A summary of the change strategies is provided as written in the KSDE report submitted this past October 2017.

1. One action taken since the last accreditation review intended to elevate students' performances in the science grades 5-8 teacher education program has been to encourage greater professional engagement by science grades 5-8 candidates. Examples of such involvement include serving as departmental student assistants, tutors, etc. in either paid or unpaid capacities and be active in student organizations such as the Emporia State University National Science Teachers Association(NSTA) Student Chapter, Biology Club, American Chemical Society student affiliate, Society of Physics Students, and the Earth Science Club. Serving in these capacities or similar roles represent a stage in the transition from student to student teacher to science grades 5-8/MLS teacher and professional educator. Increased responsibilities have the potential to improve science grades 5-8 candidates' content knowledge (e. g., deeper thinking required when considering students' questions) and instructional skills (e. g., responding to individual student questions). A goal is to involve as many science grades 5-8 candidates/program completers as possible with the predicted result being demonstrable improvement in their content knowledge and professionalism.
2. A second action attempted was to increase communication of assessment results among faculty and candidates although, achieving this goal has been a challenge. Faculty can be involved in assessment of candidates' levels of achievements of various standards or through other interactions (e.g., candidate assisting in laboratory). The Physical Sciences Education Coordinator compiles data and ultimately has been responsible for submitting reports. Candidates must receive departmental approval to proceed to Phase II, student teaching. Discussion of science grades 5-8 candidates' strengths and weaknesses occurs at a departmental meeting prior to the department vote that approves or denies admission to Phase II. The science grades 5-8 BSE annual report has been shared with the Physical Sciences department chair and selected faculty from chemistry, physics, earth science, and biology. At best, efforts to more fully communicate assessment results with candidates can be characterized as having mixed results. In PS430 Nature of Science, science grades 5-8 candidates receive feedback on some, but not all, science grades 5-8 standards. The costs in time have prevented greater sharing of assessment information with candidates. The desire was that with greater candidate and faculty awareness of standards and the role of assessments in providing evidence of their achievement, more focused candidate performance would lead to improved candidate performance on content assessments. Another predicted change was faculty focusing on strategies to improve student performance in assessed areas, e. g., modification of curriculum, instruction, or assessment strategies. Critical course most likely to be affected are

first-year courses. Science grades 5-8 program completers do receive results of Student Teacher Evaluations and Teacher Work Sample results and have opportunities to discuss these.

3. For whatever reason, there seems to be a comfort level with the assessments developed locally, but a greater concern for one of the the national assessments. Perhaps this concern is fueled because of the issue of "control." National assessments are beyond the control of faculty at ESU. Praxis II PLT results are not a concern. Praxis II Middle School Science Science Content Test results are generally not a concern with regard to science grades 5-8/MLS candidates since they achieve passing scores at an acceptable rate. However, scores can be improved. Actions are being considered to ensure earning a passing score on the first attempt (this is not an identified problem), and to improve the total scores of science grades 5-8/MLS test takers. Actions proposed or undertaken include:
 4. Through advising, increase awareness of the need to focus on science grades 5-8/MLS content test preparation as starting at enrollment and not as "last minute" preparation.
 5. Through advising, identify a "best" time to take the Middle School Science content test. Sometimes financial considerations dictate when candidates take their tests. Others have a significant time lapse between completion of certain science courses and taking the test, or they attempt the test (and others) during student teaching. Individual circumstances should be considered to identify a best time for test completion.
 6. Improve test preparation by increasing awareness of science grades 5-8/middle level science test topics and testing conditions by directing both students and faculty to online and paper sources of information provided by Educational Testing Services (ETS).
 7. Analyze course content for areas where candidates score low and review those components of the course.

With the actions listed above, a predicted result is improved candidate learning that will produce improved performances on the Praxis tests. Thus far, with limited numbers of test takers, there have been no identifiable systematic areas of weakness. Rather, if weaknesses exist, they appear to be individual rather than systemic.

ESU faculty are resolved to elevate science grades 5-8/MLS candidates' performances, improve the science grades 5-8/middle level science teacher education program, and the level of performance of science grades 5-8 program completers. The self-study and critical review by outside professionals that occurs as part of the accreditation process play an important role in achieving the goals of continuous improvement and development of science grades 5-8/middle level science candidates as professionals.

AY 2017

See attached reports for KSDE assessment. In section V of the KSDE report, strategies to improve candidate and program performance were related to encouraging greater professional engagement and involvement to better prepare students in the transition from student to student teacher to professional educator. Participating in and serving as leaders in student organizations was believed to grow content knowledge and professionalism. An additional change strategy was directed toward faculty attention on strategies to improve student performance in assessed areas leading to modification of curriculum, instruction, or assessment strategies typically in first-year courses. Approved advising was deemed important in preparing students by increasing awareness of the need to focus on science grades 5-8/MLS content test preparation beginning at enrollment encouraging proactive preparation and planning.

AY 2016

The curriculum map for BSE Middle School Science was completed and is being used to create an assessment plan for this academic year.

AY 2015

Section V of the KSDE report is dedicated to reporting the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance.

Affiliated evidence files showing students performances are attached. Section V is shown here to highlight changes to improve student learning.

The Conceptual Framework (CF) identifies six proficiencies that are developed to reach a level of competency characterized as being The Professional. This vision of being The Professional is based on providing service to society, applying interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, engaging in effective practice, responding to uncertainty and change, relying on self-reflection, and belonging to a professional community. The science grades 5-8/middle level science (MLS) teacher education program of studies is designed to provide opportunities for these candidates to develop their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to become professional educators. For the vision to become more than simply words on paper, data from useful assessments need to be analyzed. The analyses need to produce actions, and the actions need to produce positive results that improve candidate performance and strengthen the science grades 5-8/middle level science teacher education program of studies.

Among faculty, there is a sense of satisfaction that 80% or more of the science grades 5-8/middle level science (MLS) candidates admitted to teacher education progress through the program and successfully complete all program requirements. Science grades 5-8/MLS are required to have another area of licensure. Most frequently, candidates admitted to teacher education who do not complete all program requirements elect to pursue other non-teaching majors. Infrequently, a candidate may be unsuccessful in completing one or more program requirements and leave the university or pursue other education and career options. As a generalization, the performance of science grades 5-8/MLS

candidates may be characterized as "average" on both national assessments (e. g., Praxis II PLT) and on ESU developed assessments (e. g., Teacher Work Sample) when compared to other ESU test takers. Science grades 5-8/MLS candidates' performances on the Student Teacher Assessment, as evaluated by cooperating teachers, often results in these candidates receiving grades of "A" and a "B" grade is infrequent.

With the relatively small number of science grades 5-8/MLS candidates, caution is advised when making generalizations and when comparing groups. Despite this cautionary note, Emporia State University strives to take actions that will elevate the performances of candidates and improve the science grades 5-8/MLS teacher education program. Rather than attempting to pursue or suggest a myriad of actions that by their number could lead to a lack of follow-through and success, efforts will focus on a few actions to elevate science grades 5-8/MLS candidates' performances and improve the program.

1. One action taken since 2010 intended to elevate students' performances and improve the science grades 5-8/MLS teacher education program has been to encourage science grades 5-8 candidates serve as departmental student assistants, tutors, etc. in either paid or unpaid capacities and be active in student organizations such as the Emporia State University National Science Teachers Association Student Chapter, Biology Club, American Chemical Society student affiliate, Society of Physics Students, and the Earth Science Club. Serving in these capacities or similar roles represent a stage in the transition from student to student teacher to science grades 5-8/MLS teacher and professional educator. Increased responsibilities have the potential to improve candidates' content knowledge (e. g., deeper thinking required when considering students' questions) and instructional skills (e. g., responding to individual student questions). Of the seven 2010-2013 candidates three are known to have held student assistant positions (Note: funding has affected opportunities available) and two others were employed by ESU or a local school district in positions of responsibility. Being a member of a student organization with the opportunity to attend professional conferences has the potential to cause candidates to begin the transition from student to teacher, and eventually, professional educator. Three of the seven held officer positions in one or more student organizations. The departmental goal is to involve as many candidates as possible with the predicted result for candidates being demonstrable improvement in their content knowledge and professionalism.

2. A second action proposed in 2010 was to increase communication of assessment results among faculty and candidates. Faculty are involved in assessment of candidates' levels of achievements of various standards. The Physical Sciences Education Coordinator compiles data and ultimately is responsible for submitting reports. Candidates must receive departmental approval to proceed to Phase 2, student teaching. Discussion of candidates' strengths and weaknesses occurs at a departmental meeting prior to the department vote that approves or denies admission to Phase

3. It was proposed in 2010 that greater communication of assessment results would be provided to candidates. At best this effort can be characterized as having mixed results. In PS430 Nature of Science, candidates receive feedback on some, but not all, science grades 5-8 standards. The costs in time have prevented greater sharing of assessment information with candidates. Faculty assessments of students' achievement or lack of achievement related to standards is not always shared with other relevant faculty, nor is it always shared with science grades 5-8/MLS candidates. Greater discussion of candidates' strengths and weaknesses can benefit individuals and lead to program improvement. Such discussions have the potential to lead to earlier remediation of problem areas, if any exist. Grouped data would allow students to see where they rank compared to others and individual data would allow science grades 5-8/MLS candidates to track their own progress. More focused candidate performance should lead to improved candidate performance on content assessments. Another predicted change is faculty focusing on strategies to improve student performance in assessed areas, e. g., modification of curriculum, instruction, or assessment strategies. Critical course most likely to be affected are first-year courses in earth science, chemistry, and physics.

4. For whatever reason, there seems to be a comfort level with the assessments developed locally, but a greater concern for one of the the national assessments. Perhaps this concern is fueled because of the issue of "control." National assessments are beyond the control of faculty at ESU. Praxis II PLT results are not a concern. Praxis II Middle School Science Science Content Test results are generally not a concern with regard to science grades 5-8/MLS candidates since they achieve passing scores at an acceptable rate. However, scores can be improved. Actions are being considered to ensure earning a passing score on the first attempt (this is not an identified problem), and to improve the total scores of science grades 5-8/MLS test takers. Actions proposed or undertaken include:

a. Through advising, increase awareness of the need to focus on science grades 5-8/MLS content test preparation as starting at enrollment and not as "last minute" preparation.

b. Through advising, identify a "best" time to take the Middle School Science content test. Sometimes financial considerations dictate when candidates take their tests. Others have a significant time lapse between completion of certain science courses and taking the test, or they attempt the test (and others) during student teaching. Individual circumstances should be considered to identify a best time for test completion.

c. Improve test preparation by increasing awareness of science grades 5-8/middle level science test topics and testing conditions by directing both students and faculty to online and paper sources of information provided by Educational Testing Services (ETS).

d. Analyze course content for areas where candidates score low and review those components of the course.

With the actions listed above, a predicted result is improved candidate learning that will produce improved performances on the Praxis tests.

ESU faculty are resolved to elevate science grades 5-8/MLS candidates' performances and improve the science grades 5-8/middle level science teacher education program. The self-study and critical review by outside professionals that occur as part of the accreditation process play an important role in achieving the goals of continuous improvement and development of science grades 5-8/middle level science candidates as professionals.

Attached Files

- [Assess 1 Data Tables for Science 5-8 Praxis II and PLT 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table Sci5-8 TWS 1-4 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 2 Sci5-8 Rubric](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ST Sci 5-8 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Sci 5-8 TWS 5-7 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 4 Sci 5-8 Rubric](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 1, 2, 3 for KS Ed 2010-2016](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 KS Ed 2010-2016](#)
- [Assess 6 Sci 5-8 Rubric](#)
- [Assess 7 Sci5-8 Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2016](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [F16 Science5-8 Template2015_OldStandards](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables for Science 5-8 Praxis II and PLT 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table Sci5-8 TWS 1-4 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 2 Sci5-8 Rubric](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ST Sci 5-8 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Sci 5-8 TWS 5-7 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 4 Sci 5-8 Rubric](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 1, 2, 3 for KS Ed 2010-2013](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 KS Ed 2010-2013](#)
- [Assess 6 Sci 5-8 Rubric](#)
- [Assess 7 Sci5-8 Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2013](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [MLScienceRptF13-1011,1112,1213](#)
- [sci 5-8 March 2013 PASL](#)
- [Assess 2 Sci5-8 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [BSE Checklist Fall 2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 1 Data Tables for Science 5-8 Praxis II and PLT 2016-2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 2 Data Table 5-8 MLS KPTP Tasks 1-Context & Lrng Env & 2-Designing Instruct](#)
- [Copy of Assess 2 Data Table Sci5-8 TWS 1-4 2014-2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 3 Data Table ST Sci 5-8 2016-2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 4 Data Table 5-8 middle school KPTP Tasks 3-Tchg & Lrng Env and 4-Refl & Prof 2016-2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 4 Data Table Sci 5-8 TWS 5-7 2016-2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 5 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 1, 2, 3 for KS Ed 2014-2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 6 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 KS Ed 2014-2017](#)
- [Copy of Assess 7 Sci5-8 Inq Safe Data Table 2016-2017](#)
- [Science5-8 Template2015_OldStandards C.Aguirre](#)
- [LAS-PS-MIDDLE SCHOOL SCIENCE-BSE](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables for Science 5-8 Praxis II and PLT.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)

- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Sci5-8 TWS 1-4 2014-2017.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table 5-8 MLS KPTP Tasks 1-Context & Lrng Env & 2-Designing Instruct.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table ST Sci 5-8.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 5-8 middle school KPTP Tasks 3-Tchg & Lrng Env and 4-Refl & Prof.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table Sci 5-8 TWS 5-7.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 1, 2, 3 for KS Ed.xls](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Sci5-8 Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 11 KS Ed.xls](#)
- [Assessment 6 Sci 5-8 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Sci5-8 Inq Safe Data Table.xls](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric.doc](#)
- [ESU Science5-8 Template2015 OldStandards.docx](#)
- [Science 5-8 Program of Study.doc](#)

Program Name: Geospatial Analysis Certification

Summary of Program Assessments:

The Geospatial Analysis Certification curriculum is contained in the curriculum maps of the programs within the Physical Sciences department. This curriculum is assessed as a part of the program in which it exists as a major program of study. Therefore, there isn't a separate curriculum map or assessment plan.

Program Name: Physical Sciences MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Note: the Physical Sciences MS assessment reporting will transition to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan beginning in AY 2018.

AY 2016

The central courses for each of the concentrations (chemistry, earth science and physics) were identified. The curriculum maps were constructed. The next step will be to analyze the maps and develop assessment cycles for each of the concentrations.

Program Name: Physics BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Note: the Physics BS/BA assessment reporting will transition to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan beginning in AY 2018. After completing the curricular map for the physics program (BA/BS/BSE) last academic year (2015-2016), each of the faculty chose one course to assess student learning outcomes. Assessment was provided by all tenure-track or tenured faculty including Dr. Jorge Ballester, Dr. Robert Jones, and Dr. Chris Pettit.

Faculty identified the approach of assessment for the single course during the 2016-2017 academic year. The only emphasis was to assess a general education course. For the physics program, Introduction to Space Science (PH 110) fulfills the physical-science general-education requirement.

In the fall semester, we will return to the curriculum map for the physics program, check student learning objectives on syllabi, and implement a regular, once-a-semester assessment strategy with the idea being to assess every course once in a three-year cycle. The assessment provided in this report is a good start to program assessment.

Evidence of assessment

PH 110 Introduction to Space Science Spring 2017 Dr. Jorge Ballester

Student learning objective: Demonstrate knowledge of concepts and principles in a wide range of Academic Disciplines.

Measurement: Assessment reporting template incomplete

Future plans:

Assessment recommendation: Complete the questions for measuring student learning, reporting findings, and identifying improvement strategies as a result of assessment findings.

PH 140 College Physics I Fall 2016 Dr. Robert Jones

Student learning objective: Think critically and analytically about an issue, idea or problem.

Measurement: Students have come to me for help and claimed that they "understand the concept but don't know how to do the problems." In its most extreme form this can be seen on tests directly and in homework when students leave questions blank. To a lesser degree, answers are partially incomplete.

Future plans: During the first day or two of class, I am now handing out a problem-solving flow chart from The Physics Teacher, January 1985, page 32 created by Charles Wood, the problem solving checklist from The Physics Teacher, April 1991, page 238 created by Wendy Padgett, along with some strategies of my own. As the course proceeds I slowly present and develop each of these methodologies using practical real world examples. I think I am seeing a reduced number of test questions left blank. (But of course I am dealing with a different cohort of students each time through.)

Assessment recommendation: In the future, identify a problem (as you have) and then, quantitate the number of students who have fully answered the question and partially answered the question to determine if the problem-solving flow chart has affected student learning. To complete an assessment cycle, identify the problem, propose and implement a remedy, then measure to see if the remedy has helped. The measure does not necessarily need to be quantitative, but this helps one to determine if the remedy has helped (all things else considered equal, like the cohort of students in the course).

PH 190 Physics I Spring 2017 Dr. Chris Pettit (18 Students)

Student learning objective: Demonstrate KNOWLEDGE of concepts and principles in a wide range of ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES.

Measurement: I used a multiple choice question on an exam to assess the students' knowledge of Newton's 3rd law. Of 18 people who took the exam, 9 answered the question correct.

Future: I intend to spend more time on this concept in the future and provide a more thorough discussion of this concept with a larger set of examples to reinforce the idea.

Assessment recommendation: This is a good start. Repeat the question to see if your proposed changes improve student learning.

AY 2016

Like the BS/BA chemistry map, the BS/BA physics curriculum map in the file library illustrates an approach towards program assessment. The learning outcomes are collected from syllabi and are mapped to program goals. As evidenced by the map, the sum of courses in the program are addressing all the program goals.

Attached Files

[LAS-PS-PHYSICS-BS-BA](#)

Program Name: Physics BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

The BSE assessment is documented through the assessment report for KSDE. See attached documentation.

AY 2016

The curriculum for the Physics BS/BA is common to the curriculum for the BSE program. The curriculum map for BS/BA Physics was completed and is being used to create an assessment plan for this academic year which will be aligned with the assessment structure of the BSE program as directed by both the KSDE and the CAEP specialized accreditation.

AY 2015

The Conceptual Framework (CF) identifies six proficiencies that are developed to reach a level of competency characterized as being The Professional. This vision of being The Professional is based on providing service to society, applying interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, engaging in effective practice, responding to uncertainty and change, relying on self-reflection, and belonging to a professional community. The chemistry teacher education program of studies is designed to provide opportunities for chemistry candidates to develop their

knowledge, skills, and dispositions to become professional educators. For the vision to become more than simply words on paper, data from useful assessments need to be analyzed. The analyses need to produce actions, and the actions need to produce positive results that improve candidate performance and strengthen the chemistry teacher education program of studies.

Among faculty, there is a sense of satisfaction that 80% or more of the 2010-2013 physics candidates admitted to teacher education progress through the program and successfully complete all program requirements. Most frequently, candidates admitted to teacher education who do not complete all program requirements elect to pursue other non-teaching majors. Infrequently, a candidate may be unsuccessful in completing one or more program requirements and leave the university or pursue other education and career options. As a generalization, the performance of physics candidates may be characterized as "average" on both national assessments (e. g., Praxis II content and Praxis II PLT) when compared to test takers nation-wide and on ESU developed assessments (e. g., Teacher Work Sample) when compared to other ESU test takers. Historically, physics candidate performance on the Student Teacher Assessment, as evaluated by cooperating teachers, most often results in the physics candidates receiving a grade of "A" but some occasionally earn a "B." On Departments of Physical Sciences developed assessments (e. g., PS430 Nature of Science Project and PS430 Nature of Science Test), physics candidates' performances can be characterized as average to above average.

With the relatively small number of physics candidates, caution is advised when making generalizations and when comparing groups. Despite this cautionary note, Emporia State University strives to take actions that will elevate the performances of candidates and improve the physics teacher education program. Rather than attempting to pursue or suggest a myriad of actions that by their number could lead to a lack of follow-through and success, efforts will focus on a few actions to elevate chemistry candidate performance and improve the program.

1. One action taken since 2010 intended to elevate students' performances in the physics teacher education program has been to encourage physics candidates to serve as departmental student assistants, tutors, etc. in either paid or unpaid capacities and be active in student organizations such as the Emporia State University National Science Teachers Association Student Chapter and the student organizations affiliated with physics such as the Society of Physics Students. Serving in these capacities or similar roles represent a stage in the transition from student to student teacher to physics teacher and professional educator. Increased responsibilities have the potential to improve physics candidates' content knowledge (e. g., deeper thinking required when considering students' questions) and instructional skills (e. g., responding to individual student questions). Of the four 2010-2013 candidates, all held student assistant positions (Note: funding can affect positions available). One candidate received funding to conduct research in the summer. Being a member of a student organization with the opportunity to attend professional conferences has the potential to cause students to begin the transition from student to teacher, and eventually professional educator. Three of the four candidates held officer positions in one or more student organizations. The departmental goal is to involve as many students as possible with the predicted result for candidates being demonstrable improvement in their content knowledge and professionalism.

2. A second action proposed in 2010 was to increase communication of assessment results among faculty and among students. Faculty are involved in assessment of physics candidates' levels of achievement of various standards. They are given the opportunity to rate candidates on the candidates' achievement of selected standards. The Physical Sciences Education Coordinator compiles data and ultimately is responsible for submitting reports. Candidates must receive departmental approval to proceed to Phase 2, student teaching. Discussion of physics candidates' strengths and weaknesses occurs at a departmental meeting prior to the department vote that approves or denies admission to Phase 2.

3. It was proposed in 2010 that greater communication of assessment results would be provided to physics candidates. At best, this effort can be characterized as having mixed results. In PS430 Nature of Science physics candidates receive feedback on some, but not all, physics standards. In 2010 it was suggested that as assessment data are compiled, such data could be shared with physics candidates. This has proven to be too costly with regard to time for it to have been accomplished. Some grouped data have been shared with a few members of the ESU National Science Teachers Association Student Chapter. The hope was that with greater candidate and faculty awareness of standards and the role of assessments in providing evidence of their achievement, more focused candidate performance would lead to improved candidate performance on content assessments. Another predicted change was faculty focusing on strategies to improve student performance in assessed areas, e. g., modification of curriculum, instruction, or assessment strategies. Critical courses most likely to be affected are the first-year courses.

4. For whatever reason, there seems to be a comfort level with the assessments developed locally, but a greater concern for one of the the national assessments. Perhaps this concern is fueled because of the issue of "control." National assessments are beyond the control of faculty at ESU. Praxis II PLT results are not a concern. Praxis II Physics Content Test results are somewhat of a concern. All physics program completers achieve passing scores. One physics candidate, who did not complete the program took the physics content test and did not pass it. She elected to pursue a non-teaching career. Actions are being considered, and some have been taken to improve the "efficiency" of physics test takers, i. e., improve the percentage of physics test takers who pass on the first attempt. Actions proposed or undertaken include:

- a. Through advising, increase awareness of the need to focus on physics content test preparation as starting at enrollment and not as "last minute" preparation.
- b. Through advising, identify a "best" time to take the physics content test. Sometimes financial considerations dictate when candidates take their tests. Others have a significant time lapse between completion of certain physics courses and taking the test or they attempt the test (and others) during student teaching. Individual circumstances should be considered to identify a best time for test completion.
- c. Improve test preparation by increasing awareness of physics test topics and testing conditions by directing both students and faculty to online and paper sources of information provided by Educational Testing Services (ETS).
- d. Analyze course content for areas where candidates score low and review those components of the course.

With the actions listed above, a predicted result is improved candidate learning that will produce improved performance on the Praxis tests.

ESU faculty are resolved to elevate physics candidates' performances and improve the physics teacher education program. The self-study and critical review by outside professionals that occur as part of the accreditation process play an important role in achieving the goals of continuous improvement and development of physics candidates as professionals.

Attached Files

- [Assess 1 Data Tables Physics Praxis II and PLT Tests 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table Physics TWS 1-4 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 2 Physics Rubric](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ST Physics 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Physics TWS 5-7 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 4 Physics Rubric](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Physics Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 5 Physics Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table Physics Stds 1, 2, 3 KS ED 2010-2014](#)
- [Assess 6 Physics Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table Physics Stds 5, 6, 7 2007-2016](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 Physics Rubric](#)
- [Assess 8 Physics Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2016](#)
- [F16 Physics Template2015 OldStandards](#)
- [LAS-PS-PHYSICS-BSE](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables Physics Praxis II and PLT Tests 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 2 Physics Rubric](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ST Physics 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Physics TWS 5-7 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 4 Physics Rubric](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Physics Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 5 Physics Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table Physics Stds 1, 2, 3 KS ED 2010-2013](#)
- [Assess 6 Physics Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table Physics Stds 5, 6, 7 2007-2013](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 Physics Inq Safe Data Table 2010-2013](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Physics TWS 1-4 2007-2013](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric](#)
- [physics Mar. 2013 PASL](#)
- [PhysicsRptF13-1011,1112,1213](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables Physics Praxis II and PLT Tests 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assess 2 & 4 KPTP Template](#)
- [Assess 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table Physics KPTP Tasks 1-Context & Lrng Env & 2-Designing Instruct](#)

- [Assess 2 Data Table Physics TWS 1-4 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 2 Physics Rubric TWS 1-4](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table ST Physics 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assess 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Physics KPTP Tasks 3-Tchg & Lrng Env and 4-Refl & Prof](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table Physics TWS 5-7 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 4 Physics Rubric-TWS Factors 5-7](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Physics Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 5 Physics Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table Physics Stds 1, 2, 3 KS ED 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 6 Physics Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table Physics Stds 5, 6, 7 2014-2017](#)
- [Assess 7 Scoring Guide](#)
- [Assess 8 Physics Rubric](#)
- [Assess 8 Physics Inq Safe Data Table 2014-2017](#)
- [BSE Checklist Fall 2017](#)
- [Su17 Physics Template2015_OldStandards](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Physics KPTP Tasks 1-Context & Lrng Env & 2-Designing Instruct.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Physics TWS 1-4.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Physics Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Physics Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables Physics Praxis II and PLT Tests.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table ST Physics.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table Physics KPTP Tasks 3-Tchg & Lrng Env and 4-Refl & Prof.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table Physics TWS 5-7.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Physics Rubric-TWS Factors 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Physics Scoring Guide.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Physics Stds 1, 2, 3 KS ED.xls](#)
- [Assessment 6 Physics Scoring Guide.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table Physics Stds 5, 6, 7.xls](#)
- [Assessment 7 Scoring Guide.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Physics Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Physics Inq Safe Data Table.xls](#)
- [Physics Program of Study.doc](#)
- [Su17 Physics Template2015_OldStandards.docx](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments :

Academic Year 2018

Overall, the assessment practices in the department have made great strides. There are assessment plans in place for all programs. Faculty assessed and reported their findings and strategies for their courses in the year 2 of the 5-year plans. The KSDE required assessments and reporting were completed and are integral to the upcoming KSDE and CAEP reviews. The decision to inclusively assess the BA/BS/BSE programs, I believe will serve you well. Comprehensively, combining the course level assessments for the 5-year plans with the thoroughness of the KSDE required assessments will produce valuable results in keeping the curriculum current and improving student learning experiences.

In the 5-year program level assessment plans, you do a nice job of presenting the course level student learning outcomes assessment reports and critiquing the assessment practices of the faculty. In fact, this method of presenting the information is worthy of sharing with the other members of SLAC. By critiquing the assessment practices, findings, recommendations, you are adding in an additional layer of feedback

which is highly valuable in building assessment capacity among your department faculty. For this being the first year of comprehensive reporting using the course level assessment reporting tool (previously it was just general education courses), you have many faculty who are understanding of the course-embedded student learning outcomes assessment processes. And, for those who may be struggling you recommend professional development in the way of workshop attendance. This is a great strategy. The other positive thing to remember is that there were some genuine strategies being employed to improve student learning and the accumulation of these strategies will be seen in students success and achievements over time.

Maintaining a focus on student learning, assessing student learning outcomes, making adaptations to improve the learning experience, and using information to evolve the curriculum, will all lead to a direct improvement of the program. It's not about those students who don't try, it's about those students who do genuinely care and are willing to work with the instructor to make the learning experience more productive. I think getting our faculty (institution-wide) to understand this concept of continuously working toward the perfect learning experience is the greatest challenge. I also believe that as faculty realize that their assessment efforts are respected and appreciated instead of thinking that its about evaluating their instruction skills, that overall productivity and gains from assessment practices will improve concurrently. The Physical Sciences department faculty are poised for these constructive gains in student success, as you have more positive assessment practices occurring than not. The assessment reporting tool has been changed to add in program objectives and course student learning outcomes, this should help with the structure you are asking your faculty to use when identifying exactly what is being assessed in their courses. Thank you for the suggested edits and inputs to this process, as all assessment practices are up for review and improvements! Again, thank you for all your efforts, expertise, and direction you are providing for the Physical Sciences department assessment plans and practices. Excellent job!

Academic Year 2017

The planning and implementation of assessment practices across the physical sciences curriculum continues to improve and become prevalent in all major programs including the department's contribution to the general education program curriculum. Your strategy to have faculty learn from colleagues from other departments is a good strategy. There are also some faculty learning opportunities offered through face-to-face assessment topic workshops and/or the online course dedicated to professional development of faculty assessment skills. The course is self-paced, asynchronous, and available on demand. Faculty can sign-up for these learning opportunities by contacting the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

Faculty course embedded assessments for the Chemistry BS/BA program have increased and there is a cohesive plan for how faculty approach strategies to improve the student learning experience. Incremental strategic improvements across all courses in the curriculum builds a refined student centered learning approach and generates high volume improvement in short time spans. Noticing that students continue to struggle with equilibrium and equilibrium constant from CH126 to CH376 can be used as a conversation starter for faculty in approaching how best to comprehensively reduce the lag in learning expectations. The KSDE reports (strategies for improvement section V) are very valuable assessment applications for those programs whose students seek teaching credentials and licensure. The approach you are taking to integrate course embedded assessments across the curriculum in the BA/BS/BSE programs will benefit the improvement of the overall program content area concurrently. Many of the assessment practices required in the KSDE reporting are dedicated to end of program assessments and those courses making up the bulk of the curriculum are left out of the process. Your approach to assessing all courses over time is valuable to keeping the curriculum current, meanwhile consistently improving the student learning experience. It is also important to point out that you are providing "assessment recommendations" in response to each of the course embedded assessments and this a great way to encourage faculty to continue to refine their assessment practices. Your ability to continuously incorporate new assessment practices into each of the programs in your department is impressive. You have accomplished so much over the past year in planning the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycles for all your programs. You are very close to having operationalized assessment plans across all your department's programs, keep up the EXCELLENT planning and implementation strategies! It will result in improved student learning successes across your department!

Academic Year 2016

The Physical Sciences department has spent much time and effort completing curriculum maps for its multiple programs, licensures, and certificate. These maps are precise and exhibit alignment between program level outcomes, course level student learning outcomes, and course assignment by faculty member. This was a complex task and resulted in identification of commonalities among the graduate programs that will be considered for consolidation in the upcoming academic year. In addition, discipline specific concentrations across the department were identified as areas where assessment efforts should be consolidated to reduce redundancy. For the department's faculty, implementing an assessment plan that is sustainable is the goal. This will require some planning and agreement on implementing cycles of assessment as the system used in the past was too labor intensive and resulted in an unsustainable assessment plan. This resulted in not being able to reach consensus about consistent faculty assessment contributions in many programs. The programs with adequate assessment practices are those that are linked to teacher education. It is feasible that the department-wide assessment practices can be designed so that all faculty contribute to a well-planned cyclical process that will result in continuous improvement in student learning over time. There is no

doubt that the physical sciences department is conferring highly competent graduates at both the bachelor and master levels; however it is important to have an assessment plan that both confirms student competencies and identifies areas to direct improvement strategies. I look forward to collaborating with the Physical Sciences leadership and faculty in designing a sustainable, manageable, and effective assessment program.

Academic Year 2015

The Physical Sciences department has multiple bachelor of science in education degrees where students are learning how to teach specific subject matter in the physical sciences. These degrees directly align with both BA and BS degrees, thus the curricula are the same with the exception of a few teaching courses. Actually, the assessments done on behalf of fulfilling Kansas Department of Education requirements (KSDE Reports) fulfill a large role in the assessment of the programs in the department. The curriculum maps for each program will be beneficial as gaps will emerge between what is currently being assessed for the KSDE and what other parts of the curriculum are not. The assessment work that has been done on the prior academic preparation for Chemistry I and II students is outstanding. These type of assessments require the collaboration of others to pull information together, therefore the complexity level is higher than using course embedded assessments, so the efforts and expertise extended on the part of the physical sciences specifically Chemistry faculty. Overall, the assessment practices within the department are sound based on what was included in the KSDE reports, and it is concurred that the assessment cycle can use some intentional planning. Let faculty drive the direction of new assessments and choose to assess those things that faculty want to improve upon related to student learning. Good things are happening, keep on working.

Attached Files

[Physical Sciences Meta Rubric Results 2015](#)

Providing Department: Physical Sciences

Responsible Roles: (null), Eric Trump (E10000089), Kim Simons (E10238794), Jorge Ballester (E10000054), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Chemistry BS/BA/BSE

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

CH 480 will use student work samples to score the Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map as the capstone course.

Summary 2018:

SYNOPSIS OF ASSESSMENT FOR BA/BS/BSE CHEMISTRY AY 2018

There are nine faculty teaching chemistry courses: Claudia Aguirre-Mendez, Bindu KC, Andrea Luthi, Diane Nutbrown, Carlos Peroza, Kim Simons, Eric Trump, David Whipple, and Qiyang Zhang. PS 430 is included for the BSE program.

Evidence of assessment

PS 430 Nature of Science, Claudia Aguirre-Mendez, Spring 2018

I used a science knowledge survey created by Larry Flammer that focuses on topics related to understanding science, pseudoscience and the key concepts of Nature of Science. Students took this survey during the second day of class and at the end of the semester. The sample analyzed is very small. The number of students who took this class was 3. The statistical analysis using a paired t-test shows that there is not significance between the pre- and post-test means (table 1). However some of the students showed a change regarding their knowledge after taking this class (table 2). Table 1: paired Samples Test Paired Samples Test Paired Differences t df Sig. (2-tailed) Mean Std. Deviation Std. Error Mean 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower Upper Pair 1 Pretest - Posttest -4.00000 3.46410 2.00000 -12.60531 4.60531 -2.000 2 .184
Table 2: Science Survey analysis Pre/post-test Student No. Pre-Score Post-Score Difference % Change 1 21 21 0 0% 2 12 18 6 50% 3 14 20 6 43%

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

I have included more activities that allow students to teach explicitly Nature of Science concepts in a contextualized and decontextualized form.

Assessment recommendation: when completing the online reporting tool, be sure to mention which learning outcome is being analyzed. Copy and paste from the syllabus! In the future, don't paste table in the reporting tools (the formatting is lost). Instead, provide a narrative of the information. It is not clear how the assessment analysis led you to the conclusion to

include more activities; I would have thought a better assessment tool is needed before making changes to instruction.

CH 124 Chemistry I Laboratory, Bindu KC, Spring 2018

Measurement: I assessed the learning goal listed in CH 124 (Chem-I lab) syllabus by measuring the writing assignment (formal lab report) given as the mid-term exam. In Chem-I lab, students are required to submit their lab report at the end of each lab period every week. However due to the limited time frame for the lab hours, students are asked to complete their lab report which contains typically 5-6 questions related to the experiment for the day. So, the weekly lab report does not represent a good scientific lab report. Therefore, to help my students' scientific writing skills, first I explained them the importance of writing good lab reports and discussed how it will be useful skill in their professional lives. I created a mid-term writing assignment and asked them to write a formal lab report on the "Application of Beer's Law" lab. The idea was to apply the Beer's Law to determine the concentration of some unknown dye in a given liquid sample. Students were asked to collect data in the lab and prepare their lab report in a week. I outlined the criteria that would be used when grading the report, and provided to the students. I also shared a sample of a good lab report and couple of useful web-links which could be used as external resources. Some of the most commonly made mistakes were failing to define and describe Beer's Law in the Introduction section of the report, not writing an appropriate unit for the concentration value, missing the labels and captions in figures and tables, incorrect sentence structure in the "Procedure" section, not defining the variables used in the formula/equation, and not writing the formulas in equation format (using equation editor or inserting built-in equation in word file). Students were returned their graded mid-term lab report with comments and constructive feedback and notified that they would be required to write one more scientific report for their final lab so that they could apply the lessons and skills learned from the graded mid-term lab report.

Student Learning Objective(s): Articulate scientific knowledge and understanding in written contexts using well-organized scientific arguments, including proper grammar, appropriate chemistry vocabulary, and useful images (e.g., equations, graphs, etc.). Measurement: I assessed the learning goal listed in CH 124 (Chem-I lab) syllabus by measuring the writing assignment (formal lab report) given as the mid-term exam. I created a mid-term writing assignment and asked them to write a formal lab report on the "Application of Beer's Law" lab. The idea was to apply the Beer's Law to determine the concentration of some unknown dye in a given liquid sample. Students were asked to collect data in the lab and prepare their lab report in a week. I outlined the criteria that would be used when grading the report, and provided to the students. I also shared a sample of a good lab report and couple of useful web-links which could be used as external resources. After grading the reports, it was learned that the average class score was close to 81%. Some of the most commonly made mistakes were failing to write an appropriate unit for the concentration value, missing the labels and captions in figures and tables. 45% students were not clear about separating Data and Analysis section from the Result & Conclusion Section. About 85% students were not using the correct format while referencing/citing the external resources.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

Even though the guidelines were provided along with the rubric, I realized that the rubric was only giving a bulk idea, and students perhaps were not clear about how the substance of the report (e.g., data, analysis, result) versus the organization and presentation of materials (graphs, tables, grammar) will be weighted. So, I broke up the grading rubric into smaller pieces and identified each element with detail explanation that a good lab report is supposed to include, which was then given to students for their second writing assignment, counted as their lab final. The final lab practical used the same concept "Application of Beer's Law" to determine the concentration of various dyes in an unknown solution, and students were once again asked to write a lab report on their final experiment.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

Even though the guidelines were provided along with the rubric, I realized that the rubric was only giving a bulk idea, and students perhaps were not clear about how will the substance of the report (e.g., data, analysis, result) versus the organization and presentation of materials (graphs, tables, grammar) will be weighted. So, I plan to break up the current rubric into smaller pieces and identify each element that a good lab report is supposed to include. 2. I also plan to give students the second writing assignment so that they could apply the lessons and skills learned from the graded mid-term lab report with comments and constructive feedback.

Please describe the strategies previously incorporated into your course that were the result of previous assessments of student learning. Share what you learned, what worked, what didn't work, and subsequent strategies. (This question is related to those faculty who have done previous assessment iterations, but may not have had the opportunity to share their successes).

The following table compares the major topics of lab report which students find difficult or failed to address properly, before and after modification of grading rubric. For example, only 15% of students were found to include description of Beer's Law in the Introduction section of their (mid-term) lab report. However, this percentage increased to 70% after the rubric was modified (final lab report). Topics Before (%) After (%) Described Beer's Law in the "introduction" section 15 70 Used appropriate units for physical quantities 8 68 Labels and Captions in the figures and tables 23 31 Correct sentence structure in the "Procedure" section (past tense and passive voice) 32 71 Defined variables used in the formula/equation 58 93 Wrote formula in the equation format 29 85 Interpreted and discussed the result 46 89 Adding explanation on rubric and making it more informative helped students understand and apply the important scientific writing tools, significantly as reflected by above progress report.

Assessment Recommendation: Nothing at this time. The report is well-articulated and contributes to program goals. In the future, know that tables are not easily shared in the assessment reporting (last paragraph).

CH 662 Biochemistry II, Spring 2018, Andrea Luthi

One of the ways I measured student learning in Biochemistry II was through annotated bibliographies. I selected four different articles from the primary literature related to some aspect of metabolism that we had covered in class. Of the four, the students were required to write annotated bibliographies on three of them. If they did all four, I used their three best scores for their final grade. The annotated bibliographies were due throughout the semester. I provided the students with specific guidelines for writing the annotated bibliography, which included the reference, a description of the most significant and important aspects of the research, and a critique of the thoroughness, accuracy, quality, and relevance of the research. The annotated bibliographies were typed and submitted on Canvas. I graded the annotated bibliographies using the Speed Grader interface in Canvas so the students had immediate access to the feedback and could use it to improve their next annotated bibliography. For the annotated bibliography scores used to compute final grades, the average scores +/- standard deviation are 75.33 +/-12.38% for the first, 83.24 +/- 8.49% for the second, and 87.87 +/- 6.67% for the third. There was a significant improvement between the first and third annotated bibliographies. Using a paired t-test, the p value was less than 0.005. In addition, there was significant improvement from the first to the second annotated bibliography and from the second to the third annotated bibliography based on paired t-tests ($p < 0.05$). Using the feedback from each subsequent annotated bibliography, the students greatly improved their descriptions and critiques of the journal articles.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

After grading the first annotated bibliography, I spent part of a class period explaining how to write a description and critique. Many of the critiques had focused on the formatting of the article and provided no information on the accuracy, thoroughness or relevancy of the research. They also tended to take suggestions the authors made about the implications of the research as claims and reviewed them as false claims. Over the course of the semester, with lots of feedback and coaching, they learned to evaluate the research in a fair and thoughtful manner. Partway through the semester, I shared the rubric I had developed for grading the annotated bibliographies. This helped them know how they were being evaluated and enabled them to write better descriptions and critiques.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

As a result of this assignment, it became very clear to me that the majority of the students have no knowledge or experience evaluating research articles. In addition, they have difficulty identifying the significant aspects of published research. To help them start developing these skills before they write their first annotated bibliography, we will evaluate an article as a class. I will give them an article to read, and then we will spend part of a class period working together to identify the significant parts of the research and critiquing the work. This will give them a foundation on which to build their annotated bibliography skills. In addition, I will move the due dates to earlier in the semester. The fourth annotated bibliography was due the last day of classes. The end of the semester is filled with many assignments and projects, and the students aren't able to devote sufficient time to the annotated bibliographies. The scores for the last annotated bibliography will be even better if they are due when the students have more time to spend on them.

Assessment recommendation: These assessment results are clear and related to the learning outcomes of the course and the program goals. In the future, I would clearly identify which student learning outcomes is being addressed (recount from the syllabus) and how it relates to the goals of the program. The purpose of this information is to tie the assessment of the program together.

CH105 Preparation for Chemistry, Kim Simons Fall 2017

Using the Toledo 2009 Chemistry Placement Exam, I determined the number of questions in which at least half of the class answered the question incorrectly. In the 20 math questions, there were 6 questions that were answered incorrectly by a majority of the class. In the 20 general chemistry questions, there were 6 questions, and in the 20 specific chemistry questions, there were 11 questions. The average score was 33.9 (a score of 35 is needed to place into chemistry I at Florida State College in Jacksonville and 30 at Campbell University). According to Kent Chambers in his Dissertation at Texas Tech University in 2005: Grade in introductory chemistry (analogous our CH 105) has highest correlation to success in chemistry I. This is compared to ACT math, science, high school chemistry grades and the Toledo placement exam. The largest predictor of student success in class is class attendance and participation. My recommendation is to continue monitoring student progress through the CH 105 Preparation for Chemistry, CH 123 Chemistry I, and CH 127 Chemistry II. This is the first time the course is being taught. No changes at this time are necessary.

CH123 Chemistry I, Kim Simons Spring 2018

The measurement of student learning was conducted by the final exam. The question was whether the students mastered chemical naming. The student learning outcome is "demonstrate fundamental knowledge of atomic structure, ionic and covalent bonding, molecular structure, stoichiometry, reaction types, enthalpy and calorimetry, gas laws, and intermolecular forces." We used the ACS chemistry I exam (2015 version) as the final exam. On this exam, there are 70 multiple choice questions. Three of the 70 questions were directly related to naming. Overall, students correctly answered the three

questions 55% of the time. Given that these are straightforward questions without little critical thinking, I think the students either did not master the work from the initial part of the semester. On the first exam, students were correctly naming 80% of the time. So, my theory is that the students did not review sufficiently for the final exam and a minority of students never mastered the content. In the future, I would recommend, quizzes in lab (since naming is necessary to do lab work), a gateway exam to prevent students to pass chemistry without understanding chemical nomenclature, and better review materials for the final (a checklist).

CH560 Fundamentals of Biochemistry, Kim Simons Fall 2017

The measurement tool was the final exam for the course. The question is whether students could use critical thinking skills to answer questions about enzyme kinetics. The learning outcome is "analyze enzyme kinetics". Everyone could interpret a series of graphs. 4/7 answered 2 of 3 questions correctly. 3/7 answered 3 of 3 questions correctly (page 3 of the comprehensive exam). This suggests that students did retain the information and performed above or at expectations.

CH620 Elements of Physical Chemistry, Kim Simons Spring 2018

The tools used to assess student learning was the final exam. Over the period of the semester, I took my time to properly model problem-solving. The student learning outcome is "to use critical thinking skills to evaluate real world applications". First, I would identify the equation that was needed. Then, I collected constants and information to use the equation. Then, I would use the equation and always include labels. Finally, I would check the answer and compare to expectations. On the final, I noticed repeated lack of a logical problem-solving strategy. In addition, students rarely used labels, making it difficult to follow their work (another learning outcome is "to demonstrate written and oral communication skills"). I am certain this contributes to poorer than anticipated grades and a common complaint that the material was difficult. I have collected statistics from the final exam that illustrates that 50% of students did not rewrite the equation. A few had used the equation incorrectly (2/12) and most (10/12) had not labeled numbers.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

In the future, I would share my expectation that students follow a strategy so they are better able to communicate how they are solving problems. The guide would be presented to the students at the beginning of the course.

CH575 Organic Chemistry II Laboratory, Eric Trump, Spring 2018

Worksheets and Laboratory reports. Those not meeting expectations simply did not turn in assignments. Those meeting expectations did not include adequate observations or discussions in their laboratory reports. The student who did not meet or just met the expectations has difficulty understanding and completing the assignment.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

Students were reminded to turn in lab reports. Due dates were extended.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

Contact student's advisor if attendance or late homework is a problem. Give more detailed feedback on assignments.

Please describe the strategies previously incorporated into your course that were the result of previous assessments of student learning. Share what you learned, what worked, what didn't work, and subsequent strategies. (This question is related to those faculty who have done previous assessment iterations, but may not have had the opportunity to share their successes).

The additional worksheet contributed to the students' understanding. We had a greater proportion of students having a better understanding of stoichiometry and other calculations. The small percentage who failed the course lacked good study habits.

Assessment recommendation: It is not clear which learning outcome is being addressed. The focus of the assessment report is to determine if students are meeting the learning outcomes. Attend one of the assessment workshops hosted by Jo Kord if you have questions about the process.

These are the learning outcomes from the Spring 2018 CH 575 syllabus:

- 1. Safe and effective laboratory practice, use of personal protective equipment, handling of potentially hazardous chemicals, appropriate handling of hazardous waste materials. Effective methods of recording experimental procedures, including preparative methods and responsible management of experimental data.*
- 2. Fundamental methods of laboratory separations: thin layer chromatography, recrystallization, simple and fractional distillation, and simple methods of preparative chemistry, refluxing reaction mixtures, and controlled chemical transformations.*
- 3. Introduction to hands-on experience with FTIR and NMR spectrometers.*

CH123 Chemistry I, Qiyang Zhang, Spring 2018

To measure the student learning outcomes, American Chemical Society (ACS) standardized exam was used as the final for CH 123 section B. As a compare between the average score of the class (43.2/70) and the national mean (38.61/70), the average score was better than the national mean (see <http://uwm.edu/acs-exams/exams-that-need-norming/>). Notice that there were 3 students who did not take the final and thus, they were not included. The national score had a standard deviation (STDDEV) of 10.65, this class average had a STDDEV of 8.29. So statistically (student's tcal = 1.90 < ttable = 1.96),

there were no significant difference between the class average score and the national score. When compare with Spring 2017 average score (36.8/70), the average score of this class was also better, based on the same ACS exam. The high score for this class was 55/70, the low was 29/70, both numbers were higher compare those in Spring 2017 (the high score for Spring 2017 was 53, the low was 16). I did not have the STDDEV data from Spring 2017, so I cannot conclude with a statistical significance. However, the average score of this class was higher than both the national mean and the average of Spring 2017. This indicated that students had a better learning outcomes on solving integrative chemistry problems.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

ACS standard exam is a very useful tool for comparing student learning outcomes in chemistry I course. And because the date of each year is collected and summarized here, we will continue to do so. I also suggest that the STDDEV of the average score should be included, along with the average score and number of students. Another plan is to address the "hard questions" in the ACS exam. I plan to look for those topics where most students did not answer correctly. I will emphasize those topics and try give students more practice on those topics. In this way, I believe the student learning outcomes will be improved.

Assessment recommendation: As part of the program, it will be useful to longitudinally study the ACS score and students' achievement in higher level courses. From average scores on a standardized exam, one cannot make statements about whether students met your expectations in the learning outcomes you have published on the syllabus. For the purposes of this assessment, focus on a learning outcome next time. As you mention, one could use particular questions on the standardized exam.

Attached Files

- [LAS-PS-CHEMISTRY-BS-BSE](#)
- [Luthi-A-CH120-SP18.pdf](#)
- [KC-B-CH124-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Simons-K-CH123-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Aguirre-Mendez-C-CH120-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Simons-K-CH105-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Luthi-A-CH662-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Trump-Eric-CH575-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Simons-K-CH620-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Simons-K-CH560-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables Chemistry Praxis II and PLT.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Chemistry TWS 1-4 2014-2017.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table Chemistry KPTP Tasks 1-Context & Lrng Env & 2-Designing Instruct.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table ST Chemistry 2014-2017.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table Chemistry KPTP Tasks 3-Tchg & Lrng Env and 4-Refl & Prof.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table Chemistry TWS 5-7.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Chem Stds 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Chem Scoring Guide.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Chemistry Scoring Guide.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Chem Stds 1, 2, 3.xls](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table Chem Stds 5, 6, 7.xls](#)
- [Assessment 7 Scoring Guide CH test.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Chemistry Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Chemistry Inq Safe Data Table 2014-2017.xls](#)
- [ESU KSDE Report Chem Template 2017.docx](#)
- [BSE Checklist Fall 2017.doc](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

CH 123 (Chemistry I), CH 124 (Chemistry I Lab), CH 370 (General Organic Chemistry), CH 371 (General Organic Chemistry Lab), CH 479 (Undergraduate Research, PS 516 (Teaching Physical Sciences in Middle/High Schools)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

CH 126 (Chemistry II), CH 127 (Chemistry II Lab), CH 376 (Quant Analysis), CH 377 (Quantitative Analysis Lab), CH 525 (Descriptive Inorganic Chemistry), CH 560 (Fundamentals of Biochemistry), CH 572 (Organic Chemistry I), CH 573 (Organic Chemistry I Lab), CH 574 (Organic Chemistry II), CH 575 (Organic Chemistry II Lab), CH 620 (Elements of Physical Chemistry)

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

CH 660 (Biochemistry I), CH 661 (Biochemistry Lab), CH 662 (Biochemistry II), CH 720 (Physical Chemistry I), CH 721 (Physical Chemistry II), CH 722 (Physical Chemistry Lab), CH 777 (Instrumental Chemistry), PS 430 (Nature of Science)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Chemistry BS/BA/BSE

Responsible Roles: Kim Simons (E10238794)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Earth Science BS/BA/BSE

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

GO 547 will use student work samples to score the Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map as the capstone course.

Summary 2018:

SYNOPSIS OF ASSESSMENT FOR BA/BS/BSE EARTH SCIENCE AY 2018

There were five faculty teaching earth science courses in Fall 2017/Spring 2018: James Aber, Alivia Allison, Michael Morales, Richard Sleezer, and Randol Wehrbein. Also included is PS 430 for the BSE program.

Evidence of assessment

ES 110 Introduction to Earth Science, Alivia Allison, Spring 2018

1) Short Answer Question from Exam: worth 4 points: "Based on class discussion and considering the three earthquake models you tested using Styrofoam cups during the liquefaction experiment, define the process of liquefaction and describe the type and condition of sediment that is the most dangerous on which to build structures. Why would building on this type/condition of sediment be considered so hazardous?" 2) When defining liquefaction, students usually correctly stated that it is the phenomenon that occurs when solid ground temporarily behave as a liquid. However, they sometimes failed to mention that liquefaction is an Earth process that most typically occurs as a result of ground shaking from an earthquake. During grading, students lost points if they did not mention the type and condition of sediment that is the most dangerous on which to build. If they lost points, most often students stated that unconsolidated sand was very dangerous, but they failed to note that sand/gravel is also the most dangerous when saturated with water. Overall, 31 out of 44 students earned 3 points or more for this question, 8 students earned between 2.0 and 2.9 points, and 5 students earned less than 2 points for this exam question.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

I was generally pleased with the assessment results of this short answer question, however, any changes to the instruction of these topics (earthquakes and liquefaction) will be implemented the next time this assignment and exam question is given in the future. To improve student understanding of the liquefaction process, I will reword specific questions on the liquefaction handout used during this practice exercise to more directly highlight these differences previously mentioned. I will also reiterate this information through the use of PowerPoint slides and short video clips that demonstrate the liquefaction process.

Assessment recommendation: Overall, the report is very clear. I would recommend identifying the learning outcome (as stated in the syllabus) in the survey. In this case, I am uncertain which learning outcome is most appropriate (perhaps, be able to explain how and why earthquakes occur?), but it seems to be more than that. Consider updating the learning outcomes to reflect this concept if that seems appropriate.

ES 567 Topics in Earth Science: Environmental Geochemistry, Marcia Schulmeister, Spring 2018

Students were expected to collect soil and water samples as part of a field trip to a contaminated mine waste site. Groups of 4 were expected to run laboratory analyses, compile and evaluate the data, and present it in abstract and poster form. The five Objectives (O) and assessment methods (A) used to evaluate the project success are: O1: Maintain engagement during the field trip. A: Take notes and use field sampling tools technology to acquire soil and water samples. O2: Students recognize societal and environmental importance of their study. A: Students participate in discussion of environmental impacts with community members; students are able to explain impacts in an abstract for presentation at Research and

Creativity Day and are able to discuss orally during the presentation. O3: Collaborate with members of their group with diverse backgrounds and experience. A: Participate in collective writing a research plan for the lab activity after the field trip. Participate in preparation of poster for presentation O4: Understand the methods and limitations of lab and field sampling methods. A: Contribute to analysis in the lab analysis or help process the lab data. O5: be able to apply their knowledge to explain environmental chemical data. A: Students should use scientific graphs and diagrams to present their work on a poster. Numerical values were assigned to each objective for each student in an excel-based rubric.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

During the field trip, it became apparent that many students did not fully grasp the limitations of field analytical methods (Objective 4, above). An effort was made, upon return to the lab to explain the importance of checking instrument calibration by having all students combine their data with other groups expand write 2. Written abstracts revealed important basic concepts that were overlooked by students (Objective 1). Returning the assignment with comments and having students revise allowed for greater reflection on the importance of the problem. 3.

Analysis of the data lacked depth, and graphical presentations were too basic (Objective 5). Returning the assignment with comments for revision demonstrated the proper approach to interpreting and presenting geochemical data.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

To address #1 in Q13, I anticipate adding a pre-field trip exercise, in which instrument calibration and test sample analyses are reported. To address #2, a quiz covering the qualitative aspects of the site conditions and impacts to human health and environmental would be added. To address #3, a lecture on approaches to data analysis and proper methods of presenting quantitative data will be added.

Assessment recommendation: this is a strong effort at improving the learning experience for students. There are many concepts being addressed. For the purpose of assessment of student learning, focus on one learning outcome (as stated in the syllabus you provide students). Each separate concept should be submitted as a unique report using the online reporting tool. Simplify and connect (state the learning outcome in the report).

ES 110 Introduction to Earth Science, Randol Wehrbein, Fall 2017

Test. Students who took the class seriously and studied did well, while a few struggled. Three students gave up on the class because they were not performing to what they wanted and didn't drop. A student didn't try and just expected to pass because it is a 100 level course. None of these four students came to see myself, the TA, or tutor for help. Those in the middle did and improved in grade.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

Take things slower if time allows.

Assessment recommendation: the assessment cycle begins by choosing a learning outcome as identified in the syllabus (your choice). Measure how well students are meeting your expectation (exam question, responses in class, any measured indication). If doing well enough, the cycle is complete. If not, make changes to the instruction and re-assess to see if the change were an improvement. This report is not addressing if students are meeting the expectations in the learning outcome. If you want to focus on those underachieving students, ask how we can better reach them and change their behaviors (which is a difficult task).

ES 110 Introduction to Earth Science, Randol Wehrbein, Spring 2018

1) Multiple choice test with essay extra credit questions, lab exercises, and homework 2) Students who didn't meet expectations didn't take the course seriously, didn't study for the exams and didn't seek help to study. Also these students didn't turn in homework assignments. Students that met and exceed expectations took the course seriously and sought help with material they didn't understand.

Assessment recommendation: see earlier note for Fall 2017 ES 110.

ES 351 Introduction to Geospatial Analysis, Randol Wehrbein, Fall 2017

Laboratory exam which required students to show me how to make a simple map using ArcGIS. And a written portion renegading what is needed in a good map. All student met expectation, event the 1 that had skipped 2 weeks and took the exam.

Assessment recommendation: it is not clear what learning outcome is being addressed. The text is difficult to understand.

PS 430 Nature of Science, Claudia Aguirre-Mendez, Spring 2018

I used a science knowledge survey created by Larry Flammer that focuses on topics related to understanding science, pseudoscience and the key concepts of Nature of Science. Students took this survey during the second day of class and at the end of the semester. The sample analyzed is very small. The number of students who took this class was 3. The statistical analysis using a paired t-test shows that there is not significance between the pre- and post-test means (table 1). However some of the students showed a change regarding their knowledge after taking this class (table 2). Table 1: paired Samples Test Paired Samples Test Paired Differences t df Sig. (2-tailed) Mean Std. Deviation Std. Error Mean 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower Upper Pair 1 Pretest - Posttest -4.00000 3.46410 2.00000 -12.60531 4.60531 -2.000 2 .184
Table 2: Science Survey analysis Pre/post-test Student No. Pre-Score Post-Score Difference % Change 1 21 21 0 0% 2 12 18 6

50% 3 14 20 6 43%

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

I have included more activities that allow students to teach explicitly Nature of science concepts in a contextualized and decontextualized form.

Assessment recommendation: when completing the online reporting tool, be sure to mention which learning outcome is being analyzed. Copy and paste from the syllabus! In the future, don't paste table in the reporting tools (the formatting is lost). Instead, provide a narrative of the information. It is not clear how the assessment analysis led you to the conclusion to include more activities; I would have thought a better assessment tool is needed before making changes to instruction.

Attached Files

- [LAS-PS-EARTH SCIENCE-BS-BA](#)
- [Allison-A-ES111-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Allison-A-ES110-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wehrbein-R-ES110-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Schulmeister-M-ES567-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wehrbein-R-ES110-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Aguirre-Mendez-C-PS430-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wehrbein-R-ES351-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table ES KPTP Tasks 1-Context & Lrng Env & 2-Designing Instruct.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables for ESS Praxis II Content and PLT.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table ES TWS 1-4.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table ES ST.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table ES KPTP Tasks 3-Tchg & Lrng Env and 4-Refl & Prof.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 5 ES Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table ES TWS 5-7.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table ESS Stds 1-4 KS Ed 2014-2017.xls](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table ESS Stds 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11.xlsx](#)
- [Assessment 6 ES Scoring Guide.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table ESS Stds 6, 7, 8.xls](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 ES Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 ESS Inq Safe Data Table.xls](#)
- [Assessment 7 Scoring Guide.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE EarthSpaceSci Template2015_OldStandards.docx](#)
- [EarthSpaceProgramofStudy.doc](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

ES 319 (Meteorology), GO 325 (Earth History), ES 351 (Introduction to GeoSpatial Analysis), ES 546 (Field Geomorphology), ES 551 (Small Format Aerial Photography), PS 516 (Teaching Physical Sciences in Middle/High School)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

ES 365 (World Regional Climatology), GO 326 (Plate Tectonics), GO 569 (Invertebrate Paleontology), GO 769 (Vertebrate Paleontology), GO 571 (Hydrogeology), GO 572 (Contaminant Hydrogeology), ES 539 (Soil Science)

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

GO 324 (Rocks and Minerals), ES 333 (Environmental Geology), Remote Sensing (ES 771), ES 775 (Advanced Image Processing), PS 430 (Nature of Science)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Earth Science BS/BA/BSE

Responsible Roles: Kim Simons (E10238794)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Physical Science MS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

CH 829, CH 875, PS 839, PS 875, ES 739, ES 875, PH 860, and PH 890 will use student work samples to score the Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map as the capstone course.

Summary 2018:

SYNOPSIS OF ASSESSMENT FOR MS PHYSICAL SCIENCES AY 2018

Evidence of assessment

PH 741 Advanced Physics Lab I, Robert Jones, Fall 2017

Students, especially beginning students, tend to overestimate the significance of measurements they make. Virtually all of my students initially record a larger number of decimal places than are warranted by their calculations and/or measurement.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

When doing voltage measurements I had students use 2 or more volt meters in parallel and note and record the slight differences in the numbers they measure. When doing current measurements I had students use 2 or more current meters in series and note and record the slight differences in the currents they measure. In this way the students see that their measurements are of limited accuracy. I then discuss averages and standard deviation.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

Whenever possible and when time permits I will try to have students make measurements by multiple means or multiple times or both.

Assessment recommendation: In the future, please identify the learning outcome that is being addressed from those stated in the syllabus (in this case, it is obvious: "analyze the collected data including appropriate treatment of errors and uncertainties" or "generate and communicate conclusions based on the data and analysis."). To make this more quantitative, one could identify how many students are recording data to the appropriate decimal. Then, with the addition of making multiple measurements, see if the students are doing a better job at grasping the concept.

CH 662 Biochemistry II, Spring 2018, Andrea Luthi

One of the ways I measured student learning in Biochemistry II was through annotated bibliographies. I selected four different articles from the primary literature related to some aspect of metabolism that we had covered in class. Of the four, the students were required to write annotated bibliographies on three of them. If they did all four, I used their three best scores for their final grade. The annotated bibliographies were due throughout the semester. I provided the students with specific guidelines for writing the annotated bibliography, which included the reference, a description of the most significant and important aspects of the research, and a critique of the thoroughness, accuracy, quality, and relevance of the research. The annotated bibliographies were typed and submitted on Canvas. I graded the annotated bibliographies using the Speed Grader interface in Canvas so the students had immediate access to the feedback and could use it to improve their next annotated bibliography. For the annotated bibliography scores used to compute final grades, the average scores +/- standard deviation are 75.33 +/-12.38% for the first, 83.24 +/- 8.49% for the second, and 87.87 +/- 6.67% for the third. There was a significant improvement between the first and third annotated bibliographies. Using a paired t-test, the p value was less than 0.005. In addition, there was significant improvement from the first to the second annotated bibliography and from the second to the third annotated bibliography based on paired t-tests ($p < 0.05$). Using the feedback from each subsequent annotated bibliography, the students greatly improved their descriptions and critiques of the journal articles.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

After grading the first annotated bibliography, I spent part of a class period explaining how to write a description and critique. Many of the critiques had focused on the formatting of the article and provided no information on the accuracy, thoroughness or relevancy of the research. They also tended to take suggestions the authors made about the implications of the research as claims and reviewed them as false claims. Over the course of the semester, with lots of feedback and coaching, they learned to evaluate the research in a fair and thoughtful manner. Partway through the semester, I shared the rubric I had developed for grading the annotated bibliographies. This helped them know how they were being evaluated and enabled them to write better descriptions and critiques.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

As a result of this assignment, it became very clear to me that the majority of the students have no knowledge or experience evaluating research articles. In addition, they have difficulty identifying the significant aspects of published research. To help them start developing these skills before they write their first annotated bibliography, we will evaluate an article as a class. I will give them an article to read, and then we will spend part of a class period working together to identify the significant parts of the research and critiquing the work. This will give them a foundation on which to build their annotated bibliography skills. In addition, I will move the due dates to earlier in the semester. The fourth annotated bibliography was due the last day of classes. The end of the semester is filled with many assignments and projects, and the students aren't

able to devote sufficient time to the annotated bibliographies. The scores for the last annotated bibliography will be even better if they are due when the students have more time to spend on them.

Assessment recommendation: These assessment results are clear and related to the learning outcomes of the course and the program goals. In the future, I would clearly identify which student learning outcome is being addressed (recount from the syllabus) and how it relates to the goals of the program. The purpose of this information is to tie the assessment of the program together.

CH560 Fundamentals of Biochemistry, Kim Simons Fall 2017

The measurement tool was the final exam for the course. The question is whether students could use critical thinking skills to answer questions about enzyme kinetics. The learning outcome is "analyze enzyme kinetics". Everyone could interpret a series of graphs. 4/7 answered 2 of 3 questions correctly. 3/7 answered 3 of 3 questions correctly (page 3 of the comprehensive exam). This suggests that students did retain the information and performed above or at expectations.

CH620 Elements of Physical Chemistry, Kim Simons Spring 2018

The tools used to assess student learning was the final exam. Over the period of the semester, I took my time to properly model problem-solving. The student learning outcome is "to use critical thinking skills to evaluate real world applications". First, I would identify the equation that was needed. Then, I collected constants and information to use the equation. Then, I would use the equation and always include labels. Finally, I would check the answer and compare to expectations. On the final, I noticed repeated lack of a logical problem-solving strategy. In addition, students rarely used labels, making it difficult to follow their work (another learning outcome is "to demonstrate written and oral communication skills"). I am certain this contributes to poorer than anticipated grades and a common complaint that the material was difficult. I have collected statistics from the final exam that illustrates that 50% of students did not rewrite the equation. A few had used the equation incorrectly (2/12) and most (10/12) had not labeled numbers.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

In the future, I would share my expectation that students follow a strategy so they are better able to communicate how they are solving problems. The guide would be presented to the students at the beginning of the course.

CH575 Organic Chemistry II Laboratory, Eric Trump, Spring 2018

Worksheets and Laboratory reports. Those not meeting expectations simply did not turn in assignments. Those meeting expectations did not include adequate observations or discussions in their laboratory reports. The student who did not meet or just met the expectations has difficulty understanding and completing the assignment.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

Students were reminded to turn in lab reports. Due dates were extended.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

Contact student's advisor if attendance or late homework is a problem. Give more detailed feedback on assignments.

Please describe the strategies previously incorporated into your course that were the result of previous assessments of student learning. Share what you learned, what worked, what didn't work, and subsequent strategies. (This question is related to those faculty who have done previous assessment iterations, but may not have had the opportunity to share their successes).

The additional worksheet contributed to the students' understanding. We had a greater proportion of students having a better understanding of stoichiometry and other calculations. The small percentage who failed the course lacked good study habits.

Assessment recommendation: It is not clear which learning outcome is being addressed. The focus of the assessment report is to determine if students are meeting the learning outcomes. Attend one of the assessment workshops hosted by Jo Kord if you have questions about the process.

These are the learning outcomes from the Spring 2018 CH 575 syllabus:

Safe and effective laboratory practice, use of personal protective equipment, handling of potentially hazardous chemicals, appropriate handling of hazardous waste materials. Effective methods of recording experimental procedures, including preparative methods and responsible management of experimental data.

Fundamental methods of laboratory separations: thin layer chromatography, recrystallization, simple and fractional distillation, and simple methods of preparative chemistry, refluxing reaction mixtures, and controlled chemical transformations.

Introduction to hands-on experience with FTIR and NMR spectrometers.

ES 567 Topics in Earth Science: Environmental Geochemistry, Marcia Schulmeister, Spring 2018

Students were expected to collect soil and water samples as part of a field trip to a contaminated mine waste site. Groups of 4 were expected to run laboratory analyses, compile and evaluate the data, and present it in abstract and poster form. The five Objectives (O) and assessment methods (A) used to evaluate the project success are: O1: Maintain engagement during the field trip. A: Take notes and use field sampling tools technology to acquire soil and water samples. O2: Students

recognize societal and environmental importance of their study. A: Students participate in discussion of environmental impacts with community members; students are able to explain impacts in an abstract for presentation at Research and Creativity Day and are able to discuss orally during the presentation. O3: Collaborate with members of their group with diverse backgrounds and experience. A: Participate in collective writing a research plan for the lab activity after the field trip. Participate in preparation of poster for presentation O4: Understand the methods and limitations of lab and field sampling methods. A: Contribute to analysis in the lab analysis or help process the lab data. O5: be able to apply their knowledge to explain environmental chemical data. A: Students should use scientific graphs and diagrams to present their work on a poster. Numerical values were assigned to each objective for each student in an excel-based rubric.

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

During the field trip, it became apparent that many students did not fully grasp the limitations of field analytical methods (Objective 4, above). An effort was made, upon return to the lab to explain the importance of checking instrument calibration by having all students combine their data with other groups expand write 2. Written abstracts revealed important basic concepts that were overlooked by students (Objective 1). Returning the assignment with comments and having students revise allowed for greater reflection on the importance of the problem. 3.

Analysis of the data lacked depth, and graphical presentations were too basic (Objective 5). Returning the assignment with comments for revision demonstrated the proper approach to interpreting and presenting geochemical data.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

To address #1 in Q13, I anticipate adding a pre-field trip exercise, in which instrument calibration and test sample analyses are reported. To address #2, a quiz covering the qualitative aspects of the site conditions and impacts to human health and environmental would be added. To address #3, a lecture on approaches to data analysis and proper methods of presenting quantitative data will be added.

Assessment recommendation: this is a strong effort at improving the learning experience for students. There are many concepts being addressed. For the purpose of assessment of student learning, focus on one learning outcome (as stated in the syllabus you provide students). Each separate concept should be submitted as a unique report using the online reporting tool. Simplify and connect (state the learning outcome in the report).

Attached Files

[LAS-PS-PHYSICAL SCIENCES CHEMISTRY-MS](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

PH 741 (Advanced Physics Lab I), ES 546 (Field Geomorphology), ES 555 (Small-Format Aerial Photography)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

CH 572 (Organic Chemistry I), CH 573 (Organic Chemistry I Lab), CH 574 (Organic Chemistry II), CH 575 (Organic Chemistry II Lab), ES 767 (Topics: Plate Tectonics), ES 539 (Soil Science and Lab), GO 569 (Invertebrate Paleontology), GO 769 (Invertebrate Paleontology), GO 571 (Hydrogeology), GO 572 (Contaminant Hydrogeology)

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

CH 660 (Biochemistry I), CH 661 (Biochemistry Lab), CH 662 (Biochemistry II), CH 720 (Physical Chemistry I), CH 721 (Physical Chemistry II), CH 722 (Physical Chemistry Lab), CH 777 (Instrumental Chemistry), PS 540 (Modern Physics), PS 762 (Electricity and Magnetism I), PS 761 (Mechanics II), ES 771 (Remote Sensing), ES 775 (Advanced Image Processing)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Physical Science MS

Responsible Roles: Kim Simons (E10238794)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Physics BS/BA/BSE

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress:

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

PH 490 will use student work samples to score the Program Learning Objectives as outlined in the Curriculum Map as the capstone course.

Summary 2018:

SYNOPSIS OF ASSESSMENT FOR BA/BS/BSE PHYSICS AY 2018

There are three faculty teaching physics courses: Jorge Ballester, Christopher Pettit and Robert Jones. Since Introduction to Space Science is not part of the physics program, it is not included in this report.

Evidence of assessment**PH 741 Advanced Physics Lab I, Robert Jones, Fall 2017**

Students, especially beginning students, tend to overestimate the significance of measurements they make. Virtually all of my students initially record a larger number of decimal places than are warranted by their calculations and/or measurement. Please share your learning improvement strategies.

When doing voltage measurements I had students use 2 or more volt meters in parallel and note and record the slight differences in the numbers they measure. When doing current measurements I had students use 2 or more current meters in series and note and record the slight differences in the currents they measure. In this way the students see that their measurements are of limited accuracy. I then discuss averages and standard deviation.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

Whenever possible and when time permits I will try to have students make measurements by multiple means or multiple times or both.

Assessment recommendation: In the future, please identify the learning outcome that is being addressed from those stated in the syllabus (in this case, it is obvious: "analyze the collected data including appropriate treatment of errors and uncertainties" or "generate and communicate conclusions based on the data and analysis."). To make this more quantitative, one could identify how many students are recording data to the appropriate decimal. Then, with the addition of making multiple measurements, see if the students are doing a better job at grasping the concept.

PH 315 Statics, Chris Pettit, Fall 2017

The assessment used was the first in-class exam of the semester. The questions were based on fundamental ideas the students needed to know to progress through the course. The students did not do as well on the exam questions as expected. I continue to reinforce the ideas associated with these problems throughout the remainder of the course. The student also has an opportunity to improve their grade for this exam on the final exam. Out of the 10 people who originally took the exam, 7 people took the optional part of the final exam that corresponds to the first exam. Out of the 7 that retook the exam, 4 students had improved their grade. The exam questions are of comparable level to those on the original in-class exam.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

Spend additional time on this material in class, having students work out problems on the board in class and provide feedback as they work on these problems. We will specifically focus on the types of problems that students had the most difficulty with.

Assessment recommendation: Home in on a particular learning outcome from the syllabus:

- Th₁ student will be able to evaluate situations involving Forces by choosing the appropriate conceptual frameworks.
- Th₂ student will be able to recall relevant physical models and to successfully apply these models using techniques of symbolic and numerical analysis in order to generate solutions to problems in Statics.
- Th₃ student will be able to think critically by utilizing problem solving techniques to evaluate and analyze context rich, multi-step problems in Statics, selecting relevant information, selecting an approach to solving the problem and carrying out the analysis needed to generate and communicate solution(s).

Rather than addressing all of exam 1. Review a specific concept from exam 1 (and its corresponding learning outcomes) and identify how instruction could improve to address deficiencies (if needed).

PH 316 Dynamics, Chris Pettit, Fall 2017

1) Test 2) Students were not able to recognize that the exam problem required them to use relative velocity and relative acceleration as measured from a rotating reference frame. This is indicated by the poor grades on the exam question related to this topic. 4 out of the 5 students in the class answered the question and of those that answered each of them got less than 50% of the question correct.

My strategies for improving student learning the next time I teach this course are:

This topic is a difficult topic conceptually for students and unfortunately due to time it ends up at the end of the semester. There is no way to present this information earlier as it builds upon all of the previous chapters. We already spend several class days on this topic and I have them work out multiple example questions on this topic and they have several homework questions on this topic as well. In the future I intend to spend additional class time on this topic and try to have more discussion during the problem solving session to try to eliminate any flaws in their reasoning and help them recognize this type of problem.

Assessment recommendation: As per the earlier suggestion, it is not clear what learning outcome is being addressed. Upon reflection of the learning outcomes, it seems the outcomes are grossly similar to those for PH 315:

- Th₁ student will be able to evaluate situations involving Dynamics topics by choosing the appropriate conceptual frameworks.
- Th₂ student will be able to recall relevant physical models and to successfully apply these models using techniques of symbolic and numerical analysis in order to generate solutions to problems involving Dynamics topics.
- Th₃ student will be able to think critically by utilizing problem solving techniques to evaluate and analyze context rich, multi-step problems involving Dynamics topics, selecting relevant information, selecting an approach to solving the problem and carrying out the analysis needed

to generate and communicate solution(s).

The learning outcomes need to be specific to the course so they can be measured. Create learning outcomes with important topics listed (rather than "Dynamics topics"). If a difficult topic is presented at the very end of a course, either more time needs to be allotted or the topic needs to be added to the next course in the sequence. Another option would be adding an additional credit hour to the course, if needed.

PS 430 Nature of Science, Claudia Aguirre-Mendez, Spring 2018

I used a science knowledge survey created by Larry Flammer that focuses on topics related to understanding science, pseudoscience and the key concepts of Nature of Science. Students took this survey during the second day of class and at the end of the semester. The sample analyzed is very small. The number of students who took this class was 3. The statistical analysis using a paired t-test shows that there is not significance between the pre- and post-test means (table 1). However some of the students showed a change regarding their knowledge after taking this class (table 2).
 Table 1: paired Samples Test Paired Samples Test Paired Differences t df Sig. (2-tailed) Mean Std. Deviation Std. Error Mean 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower Upper
 Pair 1 Pretest - Posttest -4.00000 3.46410 2.00000 -12.60531 4.60531 -2.000 2 .184
 Table 2: Science Survey analysis Pre/post-test Student No. Pre-Score Post-Score Difference % Change
 1 21 21 0 0%
 2 12 18 6 50%
 3 14 20 6 43%

Please share your learning improvement strategies.

I have included more activities that allow students to teach explicitly Nature of science concepts in a contextualized and decontextualized form.

Assessment recommendation: when completing the online reporting tool, be sure to mention which learning outcome is being analyzed. Copy and paste from the syllabus! In the future, don't paste table in the reporting tools (the formatting is lost). Instead, provide a narrative of the information. It is not clear how the assessment analysis led you to the conclusion to include more activities; I would have thought a better assessment tool is needed before making changes to instruction.

Attached Files

- [LAS-PS-PHYSICS-BS-BA](#)
- [Ballester-J-PH110-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Jones-Robert-PH741-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Jones-R-PH741-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Pettit-C-PH190-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Pettit-C-PH315-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Pettit-C-PH315-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

PH 100 (Orientation to Physics), PH 741 (Advanced Physics Lab I), PH 351 (Statics), PS 516 (Teaching Physical Sciences in Middle/High School)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

PH 190 (Physics I), PH 191 (Physics I Recitation), PH 192 (Physics I Lab), PH 393 (Physics II), PH 394 (Physics II Recitation), PH 395 (Physics II Lab), PH 760 (Mechanics I), PH 316 (Dynamics)

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

PH 540 (Modern Physics), PH 762 (Electricity and Magnetism I), PH 761 (Mechanics II), PS 430 (Nature of Science)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Physics BS/BA/BSE

Responsible Roles: Kim Simons (E10238794)

UNIT REPORT**Social Sciences Assessment Report 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:12 AM

**Social Sciences Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

As we began AY 2018, our goals were as follows:

1. Complete curriculum mapping for the History BS, BA, and MA and the Political Science BS and BA.
2. Begin year-by-year assessment based on the curriculum maps, by assessing the first and second SLOs for the History, History M.A., and Political Science, respectively.
3. Continue with our high rate of compliance with assessment, established last year.
4. Insure that last year's gains are maintained. This includes improvement in writing skills in History (undergraduate and graduate) and Political Science, respectively, as well as improvement in Economics skills in the BSE program.

AY2017

For 2016-17, our assessment plan will be to continue the solid progress we made in 2015-16. In History, we will have our 2nd year with 100% compliance using the general education rubrics developed a few years ago, for a primary-source assignment. This also provides data for the Social Sciences Education program. In Political Science, we will continue using our new rubrics, derived from the above-mentioned ones used by History. Political Science will also re-visit our learning outcomes to ensure that they are aligned with the new rubric. Social Sciences Education will continue to use the same KSDE-mandated assessment methodologies until the new state teaching standards for teaching history are released at a forthcoming date to be announced.

In terms of implementation, History and Political Science have both identified general-education skills as the areas needing work. Historians will meet to discuss strategies to improve students' skills making written arguments and exploring multiculturalism, including possible writing workshops and a broader definition of what constitutes multiculturalism. Political Science now uses the same, standardized language about proper writing on all written assignments, and requires that all longer papers and assignments be written in multiple drafts with faculty feedback incorporated into the final draft. Social Sciences Education has asked the Economics program to re-write the questions for the content exam and those revisions will be made later this year.

AY2016

The Social Sciences Department is diverse and interdisciplinary, covering five disciplines, three undergraduate degree programs, and one graduate program. The results of each discipline cannot be combined into a single score. Instead, this report breaks down assessment results by discipline (with the results for the History graduate programs reported separately).

AY2015

Social Sciences encompasses a variety of different disciplines: History, Political Science, Social Sciences Education, and two minors: Geography and Philosophy. Due to the diversity of fields covered, all assessment in Social Sciences is done at the program level, except for general education assessment which is recorded separately. See below for program-level assessment results for 2014-15.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY2018**

This interdisciplinary department encompasses multiple disciplines, so the assessments are reported under the respective disciplines. Briefly:

1. Political Science and History mapped all of their courses to their new SLOs this year.
2. History showed high compliance and strong results in all SLOs. The lowest-scoring area for students was multicultural/diversity issues (SLO 5). In the coming year, the historians plan to address this.
3. Political Science conducted a meta-level assessment of all courses taught in the past several years. No areas of concern were identified, and political science will again teach its biannual capstone classes in AY 2019, producing new data. In the meantime, the political scientists plan to continue their focus on writing skills (SLO 4). Two political scientists also won assessment champion awards in AY 2018.
4. Social Sciences Education assessment is in limbo pending new state standards. In AY 2019, faculty plan to re-write the departmental content exam to reflect the new SLOs adopted by the History and Political Science programs in our department, and to continue the focus on economics that paid off handsomely in AY 2017. Dr. Mallein sits on the KSDE committee that is drafting the new state standards.
5. One area of concern identified is the low graduation rate in the History M.A. program-- 2 graduates in AY 2018. For AY 2019, an aggressive new plan re-vamping the degree has been approved by the faculty, the centerpiece of which is that all students will be admitted on the Exams or Social Sciences Education tracks and must petition if they wish to transfer to the Thesis track. Several other provisions are adopted, including a requirement that GTAs writing theses must have their defense dates set by the beginning of their sixth semester of GTA funding (excluding summer) or they will revert to the Exams track.

AY2017

The faculty teaching general education courses use the assessment reporting tool to enter their course assessment results and student learning improvement strategies. The department level report of these assessment results is in the file folder. Students success in social sciences major programs has shown through assessments that writing arguments has been problematic, we have addressed these issues and are awaiting trend results to see if improvement strategies have been effective. The department continues to expand and refine its program level assessment plans and has used the curriculum maps for the History BS/BA, History MA, and Political Science BS/BA programs and implemented the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans. These assessment cycles were adopted in the summer of 2017 and will be updated early in the Fall of 2017, once faculty meet to determine the sequencing for individual course assessments in years 2 through 4. The format used for these assessment plans consists of annual assessments for capstone courses and projects to determine if students nearing completion of their degrees are competent in program level student learning outcomes, meanwhile in years two through four of the cycle the courses in the curriculum are divided up and assessed to determine the quality of student learning and to ensure course currency and contributions to the program. In year five, an executive summary report is completed providing valuable feedback for implementing change strategies, curricular changes, and changes to assessment strategies. These 5-year cycles should serve the programs well by providing a comprehensive assessment of student learning at the program and course levels.

AY2016

Overall, this was an extraordinary year for assessment in the Department. History achieved 100% faculty compliance in the use of the assessment rubrics for the first time since the rubrics were created several years ago, producing a robust dataset. Assessment in the history graduate program is back on track after a difficult year in which the faculty member tasked with that job abruptly resigned, with assessment results showing strong student performance. Social Sciences Education continues to produce a lengthy, KSDE-mandated report. That report's accompanying tables highlight students' content knowledge, allowing more pinpointing of areas to address. Finally, political science has discontinued the use of single-Saturday "capstone" sessions in favor of embedding assessment into that discipline's two required methods courses: Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods. Also, the political scientists now use a rubric-graded term project instead of a multiple-choice exam as the primary source of assessment data.

Moving forward, the history faculty has a host of plans to emphasize multicultural and diversity issues, along with writing skills that stress properly constructing and citing an argument. In graduate assessment, history faculty needs to begin using their new rubric for projects and exams as well as theses. The political science faculty are satisfied with their new rubric used for a term project in a methods course, and have flagged writing mechanics as the action area for 2016-17. They have adapted new language for writing assignments and will put greater grading emphasis on using these criteria when grading student essays. Finally, Social Sciences Education is working with Economics faculty to re-write the content questions asked of students in that field and emphasizing the knowledge needed by students who have completed a single, introductory economics course.

AY2015

One of the first steps in next years 2016 academic year plan is to implement program level assessment for the History MA program. Although the program has been in existence for a long time, it was recently converted to an online program. It is very important to insure

that program quality and rigor translate to a different delivery system. As mentioned previously, faculty transition has set this process back a bit. We will continue to emphasize use of the rubric for all courses taught as a part of the general education program including all faculty using the same version of the rubric.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIAL SCIENCES 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIAL SCIENCES 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIAL SCIENCES 2014](#)
- [Attachment 1 A1 Praxis 2015 2016](#)
- [Attachment 5 A5 SS Dept C Test 2015 16](#)
- [SOCSCI General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [SocSci-Senior-Survey-UG-FA2016-SP2017-SU2017-Grads \(15\)](#)
- [2014 15 Hist Gov Program Report](#)
- [HI Assessment 15-16](#)
- [History gen ed rubric](#)
- [Political Science Learning Outcomes Rubric data 2016 nameless](#)
- [Political science rubric edited](#)
- [Social sciences assessment 2016](#)
- [Social Science Dept Content Test](#)
- [Attachment 1 A1 Praxis 2014 2015](#)
- [Attachment 5 A5 SS Dept C Test 2014 15](#)
- [GE 101 DFW](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIAL SCIENCES 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Social Sciences - AY2018.pdf](#)

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

In reviewing the assessment plans leading into the academic year and seeing the results of focused assessment efforts, it is very obvious that the department leadership and faculty are committed to assessment and the outcomes affiliated with student learning improvement strategies. The intentional planning linked to curriculum mapping, course level student learning outcomes, tools, rubrics, and templates used to track your students learning progress, and the commitment of the faculty supports quality assessment practices.

This past academic year, you had nine different faculty members submit 30 individual (13 different courses) course level student learning outcomes assessment reports. This led to 15 different course specific student learning improvement strategies. In addition, 10 different learning improvement strategies were employed during the semester, providing immediate changes to improve student learning in real-time.

Your Bachelor of Science in Education (BSE) programs are awaiting the updated standards from the state and you have the processes in place to move right into assessment and reporting mode as described in your assessment plans. The changes as per section V of the KSDE report for the BSE program are very well articulated and will lead to the improvements you are seeking. I would agree that the completers' record of achievement in certification examinations confirm the educational quality of the program. The content knowledge adaptation (more questions), as well as, adding in the bank of items dedicated to economics content will serve students well, and should improve successful outcomes in these areas. Professor Mallein's commitment to representing the department for KSDE and CAEP education standards and assessment practices is to be commended. Overseeing these practices and processes for two distinct programs requires high involvement and expertise. Her contributions assisted the institution in completing a critical series of Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) reports assessing the quality and effectiveness of these programs and verified the adequacy of the programs for CAEP accreditation standards.

The transition of the History BS/BA and MA programs into the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans appears to be productive. Your faculty's involvement in curriculum mapping, designing tools and instruments for measuring student learning, and implementing a strategy to assess the courses is excellent. The rewards will follow as involvement in the assessment practices allows for faculty ownership of the curriculum, courses, student learning, and ultimately the quality of the graduates that the program produces. I think the greatest strides made this past year were in the History MA program assessment strategies going forward. It's never easy to have to point out deficiencies, but that is always the first step to positive change. The online presence of the MA program will provide a positive stream of new students who are wanting to gain a master's level credential. Assessment practices will keep the program current and effective for those students seeking the credential. Also remember, a lot of the assessment planning and practice work is done up-front. Applying the plan allows for everyone to realize how the inflow of student learning information will guide the pathway for priorities and direction for the program in the future.

The Political Science BS/BA program is of high quality and your application of some additional layers of assessment will perpetuate the quality. Assessing an entire program with limited numbers of faculty can be stressful, it will be important to intentionally plan how you are going to divide up your individual courses in the plans for years 2, 3, and 4 in the cycle. My suggestion is that you look at the student success metrics and focus on those courses where students may be having difficulty in being successful. Start at the places where the barriers to learning are evident, then move on in subsequent years to those courses where students are more successful. You want to review all courses over time, so that you can be assured that each course is serving its purpose in the grand scheme of the curriculum and that the course content and practical application skills are current. Be sure to complete the 5-Year Assessment Plan areas for years 2, 3, and 4 by adding in the courses to be assessed. This is true for the History BS/BA, and MA assessment templates as well. Overall, I'm very excited and impressed with the advancements that the entire department faculty have made in embracing the notion of assessing your programs to improve student learning. You have made great strides, be sure to recognize your faculty for their extensive efforts as well. Nice job!

Academic Year 2017

The Social Sciences department continues to redefine its assessment practices and use faculty expertise in developing rubrics and assignments that relate to improving student learning. The focus on general education courses has been productive and the assessment report is valuable evidence that faculty are working hard to improve the student learning experience. It should be beneficial to implement the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans. The end result will be a consistent refreshing of the program curriculum map and improved student learning across all courses included in the degree program. This cyclical approach will incorporate faculty participation in assessment practices for their courses in a structured fashion, and will also allow for a continued focus on assessing general education courses as currently being done. The work ahead will involve designing rubrics for each program incorporating those program level student learning outcomes that will be scored to capstone courses and major projects. Applying these rubrics to assess student learning at or near completion of their educational experience will provide direction for change strategies and also confirm the efficacy of the program curriculum. There will be faculty professional development opportunities in the upcoming year that are directed toward course embedded assessment practices and rubrics design, if the faculty so desire to attend. For the Social Sciences department, the continuous growth in faculty participation in assessment practices is a positive cultural change. Keep up the excellent work and commitment, the effects of an increased capacity to assess and implement change strategies will result in positive and continuous improvements in the student learning experience and subsequent successes.

Academic Year 2016

It is concurred that assessment efforts department-wide this academic year have been not only improved, but achieved higher levels of coordination and participation among faculty. The History and Government BSE program assessments provided solid data recognizing the need to improve students knowledge content in economics. Using both the PRAXIS content knowledge test (external direct measurement) and the rubrics scoring (internal direct measurement) to triangulate the data to notice an area of improvement being prevalent in both measurement instruments is a best practice. If two or more measurements are supporting the same data findings then you can be better assured that improvement strategies are warranted. Collaborating with the Mathematics and Economics department (faculty member Rob Catlett) to improve the economics measurements and to align the curriculum was a great example of networking to ensure that students were meeting student learning outcomes and to improve student learning. When the 2016 KSDE report is completed in October, please upload it into the History & Government BSE AY2016 folder in the Reports and Evidence Files.

History BS/BA has shown marked improvement in faculty participation and this is awesome! Having all faculty members using rubrics to score student work samples across courses and identifying three areas for improvement strategies is a marquee best practice for course embedded assessments. You have taken assessment to a highly effective level when you can identify across the board topics for discussion and change strategies (multicultural issues and diversity; combining organization of argument and creating a well-substantiated argument with proper citations). What is even more impressive is the use of the same rubric to score student works across both face-to-face and online delivery methods (Table 1 in evidence docs). This is evidence that measures of student learning and expectations are the same across both delivery methods. It confirms the quality of the instruction. It is also best practice to make the connection between the course curriculum and the general education core goal objective for improving written communication skills. What is also impressive is the expanded diversity perspectives to include disability, sexual orientation, and gender when developing curriculum change strategies. These changes evidence faculty involvement in the dialogue to enhance student learning experiences for your history program.

Good progress has been made from 2015 in assessment of the History MA program. You have also made a good decision to use the same rating scale for all learning outcomes when scoring student works using a rubric. Having multiple scales can be confusing for students and faculty, and can imply unintentional emphasis on one learning outcome over another. Be sure to keep the communication lines open and transparent with faculty in how the MA assessment sheet applies to all 4 program tracks. It is important for all faculty and students to understand how student learning is being measured and to know how student learning is occurring across the 4 tracks (please upload the tracking sheet to the evidence documents for the History MA section). The curriculum map for the MA program is a way to show how this alignment across the 4 tracks is occurring as well.

The Political Science program used both indirect (student survey) and direct (rubric) assessment methods to identify ways to improve student learning. Also, these methods identified student advising and writing skills as key improvement areas. The transition from the multiple choice test to the rubric scoring of student works was an effective change and representative of best practices. Measuring student learning as it occurs and over the course of a project using a rubric to identify those learning outcomes that are important is much more informative than having students select the appropriate response from a multiple choice item. It generates a much keener knowledge and understanding of how the student is learning and also creates more opportunity for faculty dialogue regarding student learning achievements. The work that has been done over the past year is outstanding and kudos to having high participation among faculty. These assessment efforts will benefit all stakeholders, great work!

Academic Year 2015

The assessment program in Social Sciences shows some strengths across its degree programs. This is an outcome of ongoing assessment efforts being implemented in History and Political Science BA/BS programs. The History and Government BSE program has a highly structured assessment plan as directed by the KSDE. The reporting of student successes show that the overall program curriculum is aligned well. The one area where specific course assessment could be beneficial is in the geography curriculum. For Geography, student success in general education courses was examined by looking at course grade trends and withdrawal tendencies. In addition, the KSDE report shows (Standard 9, Subtest 4 - Geography) that completers averaged 67% proficiency on correct responses to the Praxis exam, with the State of Kansas average being 69%. This is an anomaly across all education programs, typically ESU completers score higher than state and national averages. In having two distinct sets of data showing a potential problem area, additional assessment measures are warranted. Faculty can look at a variety of contexts when gauging what is actually occurring in the courses which may be hindering student learning. It is critical to diagnose the situation thoroughly to understand the influences that may be creating learning barriers. There are many avenues to take for improving student learning and the faculty should determine the best course of action. This would make a good goal for the upcoming year. Regarding the assessment of the History MA program, it is vital that work be done on this project and by the end of the academic year have a program assessment plan in place with assessment measures for data collection defined and an implementation time line determined. A good starting point would be a revisit of the program learning outcomes and alignment with the core course learning outcomes (curriculum mapping piece). In addition, the transition of the entire program from face-to-face to online requires a thorough commitment to insure that program quality and rigor remain intact through the transition. You may want to model some of the program and course alignment work recently completed in the School of Library and Information Management. They have just engaged in the mapping process for their entire curriculum and may be able to share insights to your endeavor. For History, the summative assessments being done with a common (two versions) rubric across multiple general education courses shows that students are learning as expected. Sharing the original rubric (attached evidence files) and the results of the rubric scoring (including sample size) would enhance the depth of understanding of the process.

Adding in the assessment of individual course assignments-tests-reports would be an opportunity to look at formative (individual student works) learning to determine how well the individual parts of each course are impacting student learning. This would be a best practices next step. Faculty can choose one or two content areas within their courses to take a closer look at the quality of student learning and focus in on those things that have the best opportunity for improvement. Assessment isn't an all or nothing endeavor, it is an intentional look at particular aspects of a course and putting effort into consistent improvement over time. It is mentioned that the capstone course is up for consideration to be discontinued. An opportunity exists to refine the assessments in the capstone experience based on knowledge, skills, and values that students gain as a graduate of the programs in Social Sciences. There is an opportunity here to make the work and assessment of the capstone more valuable to students and the department. Instead of measuring knowledge recall via a multiple choice test relating to content covered over the duration of the curriculum, it may be a better determinant of student success to create a capstone experience (with credit hour and graded contributions toward degree) where students are assigned a research project where they further investigate an area of interest and require a well written paper and presentation of their works. This type of student work matches up the the highest levels of learning on Bloom's Taxonomy (Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating) meanwhile assisting students in developing mastery of highly valued communication skills. This is just a suggestion not a requirement, as the faculty in the disciplines have a much higher level of understanding and expertise of what the student learning experience should be for the social sciences. The assumption about student motivation in the existing capstone design is spot on, the data from these works would not be representative of best works. The efforts and expertise of History faculty in contributing to measuring students critical thinking skills is worthy of mention. Student works were assessed as a part of the general education program while using the AAC&U value rubric for Critical Thinking, meanwhile three faculty participated in efforts to collect student work samples and engage in assessment scoring efforts. In closing, adopting changes in curriculum and pedagogies in an every changing environment isn't easy, however it is believed that there is a degree of evidence that the department is moving in the right direction with their assessment efforts. Keep asking the questions, is the curriculum current, are students learning what we want them to, do we have mechanisms in place to help guide our student learning improvement efforts, and is everyone in? A concerted effort across the department with everyone having a role in improving student learning is doable and positive-collegial interaction is a key. Keep up the efforts!

Program Name: History and Government BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

Social Sciences Education had no new assessment reports due to KSDE this year, but we still plan to continue and follow up upon last year's work. In AY 2019, faculty will re-write the departmental content test to update the questions and bring them into line with the new SLOs developed for the History and Political Science undergraduate programs, which are detailed under "History BA BS" and "Political Science BA BS" here on Campus Labs. A more thorough re-vamping is still pending the release of new KSDE standards for History and Social Studies education. Our own Dr. Mallein serves on the state committee that is drafting these. KSDE reports will continue to be submitted on schedule during the years in which they are due. In the meantime, the new Economics questions drafted in AY 2017 insure greater compliance and more alignment with the Praxis in that field. See below. Finally, no curriculum maps are currently available due to the pending new state standards-- as soon as those are finalized, the faculty will map our courses to the new state standards and post the maps here on Campus Labs.

AY 2017

This program is a BSE-granting one, therefore a lengthy Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) report is due and is prepared annually by Dr. Darla Mallein. Dr. Mallein's report is voluminous and covers numerous, specific criteria required by the KSDE for teacher certification. It is not necessary to recap all of that here. In general, the KSDE report documents outstanding performance of our students on variables specifically linked to teacher preparation, such as creating lesson plans and classroom management. Last year, the scores on content knowledge were strong in all areas but one: economics. On both the Praxis II and the department's own, internal test, economics scores lagged in 2015-16.

There is good news this year. Students showed major growth on the economics questions. On the Praxis II, student means shot up from 54% of economics questions correct last year, to 74% this year. On the department's own content test, mean economics scores rose from 50% correct last year to 70% correct this year. Last summer, we held a discussion with Rob Catlett of Mathematics and Economics about a curriculum emphasizing the content knowledge that Social Sciences Education Majors would need, and these discussion appear to have been fruitful. As a result, we have mothballed earlier proposals to re-write the economics questions on the department content test. Student performance on those questions appears to align nicely with their performance on the Praxis II this year, so there is no need for replacement, only a continued commitment to emphasize the core concepts needed by our majors in introductory economics courses. Although Dr. Catlett teaches in another department, we have his ongoing commitment to be sure this is done and meet with us to track progress when necessary.

In other content areas, the Praxis II scores showed either consistency from year to year, or growth. The only exception was government systems, where there was a slight decline from 73% to 69%. The department content exam showed a more marked decline in certain areas, including some, such as world history, while scores in that area actually rose on the Praxis II.

This is an indication that the Department content test may not be well-aligned with the Praxis. As soon as new state standards are released for Social Sciences Education, the department will re-write our content exam. Fortunately, students scored well this year in the two subject areas that are outside our department: sociology and economics, so those questions may not need to be rewritten. Instead, we will focus on world history and government/civics, two areas where the scores on the two tests do not align, as well as Kansas history, where student scores dropped a bit this year.

AY 2016

This program is a BSE-granting one, therefore a lengthy Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) report is due and is prepared annually by Dr. Darla Mallein. That report and the accompanying tables are attached to this report as appendices.

Dr. Mallein's report is voluminous and covers numerous, specific criteria required by the KSDE for teacher certification. It is not necessary to recap all of that here. In general, the KSDE report documents outstanding performance of our students on variables specifically linked to teacher preparation, such as creating lesson plans and classroom management. The scores on content knowledge are likewise generally good, but one category stands out as needing attention. Economics is the only category in which this department's students do not exceed both state and national averages. The department's content exam shows an even more stark contrast between economics and the other content areas. Thus our priority for 2016-17 is to focus on economics content knowledge, while maintaining our students' above-average performance in the other fields.

Rob Catlett, Professor of Economics has agreed to re-write the economics questions on the departmental content exam for the 2016-17 academic year. The new questions will be completed by the end of the summer and the revised content exam will be used in the coming academic year. Prof. Catlett believes that the questions on the current content exam were designed for students currently enrolled in an economics course, not for those who may have completed a single, introductory course in the discipline several years ago. He will revise the questions accordingly. In addition, Prof. Catlett is now the sole teacher of ESU's introductory-level economics courses. While economics is taught in another department, the strong relationship among faculty across departments, centralizing of the teaching of introductory courses,

and revising of exam questions should insure that economics courses and exam questions alike sharpen the focus on key skills expected of students who completed a single course in the discipline, but may have done so a few years prior to taking the content exam and PRAXIS test.

Table 1: PRAXIS Test Results

Table 2: Department Content Test Results

AY 2015

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Description of Assessment: The Social Studies Content Test is a 2-hour standardized test administered by the Education Testing Service to determine if a beginning teacher has the knowledge and skills to teach social studies in a secondary school.

Candidates must have knowledge and understanding of the following:

- The history of the world
 - Out of a possible score of 24, the 3 years' mean score for the 48 program completers was 14.8, the range was 9-22, and the average percent of questions correct was 61%. This compares to a state average of 56% and a national average of 56%
- The history of the U.S.
 - Out of a possible score of 23-24, the 3 years' mean score for the 48 program completers was 15.27, the range was 9-24, and the average percent of questions correct was 65%. This compares to a state average of 62% and a national average of 69%
- Governmental systems in the U.S. and other nations
 - Out of a possible score of 24, the mean score for the 48 program completers was 17.06, the range was 14-22, and the average percent of questions correct was 71%. This compares to the state average of 69% and the national average of 62%
- Major economic concepts, issues, and systems in the U.S. and other nations
 - Out of a possible score of 16-18, the mean score for the 48 program completers was 11.29, the range was 7-16, and the average percent of questions correct was 66%. This compares to the state average of 64 and the national average of 62%.
- Spatial organizations of the Earth's surface and the relationships among people, places and physical and human environments.
 - Out of a possible score of 17-18, the mean score for the 48 program completers was 12.85, the range was 8-18, and the average percent of questions correct was 72%. This compares to the state average of 69% and the national average of 66%.
- Social systems and interactions
 - Out of a possible score of 12-13, the mean score for the 48 program completers was 9.05, the range was 6-13, and the average percent of questions correct was 71%. This compares to the state average of 66% and the national average of 67%.

PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

- The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is a comprehensive, 25-page assessment document prepared by Candidates during their student teaching. Our Social Science Candidates demonstrate their ability to plan, deliver, and assess a teaching unit in the social studies content area to which they have been assigned.
 - Since all Social Science program completers successfully completed the Teacher Resource Notebook Modules with a total score of 4 or 5, there is evidence that our Candidates have knowledge and understanding of significant professional and pedagogical issues and skills relevant to the profession of teaching history; e.g. memberships in professional organizations, AP and SAT II exams, National History Day projects, primary sources, Kansas Social Studies Curriculum Standards, and the debates of teaching history.

As per Section V of the KSDE report the following apply:

Based on the analysis of the assessments used for this program review, the Social Science faculty does not see the need to make any major changes in the program at this time. Instead, we will continue to monitor the changes that were implemented prior to the collection of the data used for this program review and continue to refine the department assessment tools created for this assessment report and reflect upon the yearly collection of data.

Some of the major changes we will continue to monitor were made after a new director was hired to run the Secondary Social Science Education program in 2003. These changes were based upon meetings the new director held with student focus groups, surveys conducted for advisees during enrollment, and written exit surveys collected from student teachers on their last day on campus. The information gathered from these sources spawned improvements in the following areas:

1. Advising: The new director created an advising folder that contained information about all aspects of receiving a teaching degree as well as a 2-page advising form that specifically lists every single class our BSE majors are required to take in order to receive the 6-12 license .

This form is made available to all students who declare Secondary Social Science Education as their major. One of the positive outcomes of providing the advising packets to our majors has been empowering them to take responsibility for their own learning and successful completion of the program.

2. Additional methods course: Prior to 2004, the middle and secondary level social studies methods course was a three hour course that was used to not only teach the methods of teaching social studies but also to meet specific pedagogical standards listed in the History/Government professional standards. However, both the instructor and the students complained that there wasn't enough time to cover all of the information that is needed for our Candidates to teach such an interdisciplinary discipline as the social sciences. Thus, SS 310 Introduction to Teaching Social Studies was created and approved through the curriculum review process, first as a one hour course then as a two hour course. The new two hour Intro to Teaching Secondary Social Studies course was implemented in the Fall of 2006 and has been well-received by students and faculty. The SS 310 course has strengthened the program in several ways: a) students receive more background information and resources for how to teach each of the subject areas under the social sciences umbrella for which they will be licensed; b) the instructor has more time in the actual methods course to teach Candidates how to create in-depth lesson/unit plans that contain a variety of activities and assessments that will meet the diverse needs of their future students; c) there is more time in SS 460 methods course for students to conduct mini-teaches and practice their teaching skills; d) the students are better prepared for their Phase I courses and field placement because of the instruction they receive in both methods courses; and e) the instructor is able to plan in-depth activities and assessments to help Candidates meet the pedagogical knowledge and performance indicators found in the History/Government professional standards. We believe one of the reasons our Candidates are scoring well on the TWS and in their student teaching placements is because of the instruction they receive in the methods courses.

3. Additional content courses: Other changes made within the past eight years, and prior to the implementation of this new program assessment review system, include the addition of Kansas History and Sociology to the secondary social science education curriculum. These two courses were added to the Secondary Social Science curriculum after the professional teaching standards were revised for the 6-12 History/Government teaching license. We believe the addition of these courses will continue to strengthen our Candidates' content knowledge and better prepare them for the diverse courses they will be able to teach with their 6-12 History/Government teaching license.

4 More open communication between the Secondary Social Sciences Education program director and Social Science Department faculty: In an effort to better assess the dispositions of our Teacher Candidates, each semester the Secondary Social Science Education program director provides the Social Science faculty with a list of Social Science Education majors who are currently in the SS 310 Introduction to Teaching Social Studies and SS 460 Teaching Secondary and Middle Level Social Studies Methods courses as well as those who have been admitted to or are in Phase I courses. Faculty are asked to fill out a written concern form for any student they believe isn't displaying the dispositions and skills we expect our Teacher Candidates to demonstrate. This information has improved the quality of the students being admitted to the Teacher Education program because students are warned about the requirements and expectations for secondary education majors and given the option of improving those behaviors or switching to another major. As a result of asking for this information on a regular basis, several faculty members have made a habit of stopping by the director's office and providing updates on students for whom the concern form was completed or to informally discuss concerns about other students who don't warrant a written form. Students soon learn that the entire department is watching out for them and they either improve their behavior or switch majors.

The Social Science faculty believe that the changes described above have helped strengthen our program and improved our students' performance in their Phase I courses and field placements. While we are pleased overall with the assessment results gathered for this report, we do have some concerns about our own department content test. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the social sciences and the breadth of information contained within each of the disciplines, it is challenging to provide our students with all of the content knowledge they will need in their future classrooms and/or to narrow down the content from seven subject areas to 67 questions on a multiple choice test. It is also challenging for our Teacher Candidates to remember the breadth of information covered in their content courses. Furthermore, the turnover of faculty and adjunct professors filling in for sabbaticals have also made it more challenging to ensure that the content in the standards are covered, especially in the required courses that are supposed to be aligned with the 6-12 History/Government Professional Standards.

As a result of the KSDE program review, the department content test was revised in the Fall of 2010 to reflect the reviewers' concern that 8 questions on the department content test wasn't enough to assess our candidates' knowledge of Kansas history. Therefore, the test was revised to include a total of 25 questions on Kansas history. This new version of the test was administered for the first time in December of 2010. Thirty-five candidates have completed this new version of the test. Unfortunately, the department content test scores haven't been as high as we had hoped, so the department plans to revise the department content. However, we are waiting for the new professional standards for History/Government to be approved before we revise the test. Those are supposed to be completed sometime within the next year.

Another change we made in our department's assessment program after the KSDE program review is the addition of a research paper in all upper level history courses. When enrolled in a U.S. history, world history, or Kansas history course, all students in the course will be required to complete a research paper that requires them to analyze primary and secondary sources to contextualize and compare the findings

and trends within current historiography. The history department voted to use the same rubric they use for their seniors' capstone project, so the rubric has been successfully used before. A few professors volunteered to pilot the assessment in the spring of 2012 with full implementation to begin in the fall 2012 semester. The concerns addressed in regards to our department's assessment results will continue to be discussed on a regular basis at our Back-to-School retreats in August and regularly scheduled department faculty meetings. Currently we meet every three weeks and some part of each agenda is usually devoted to assessment - assessment of the Secondary Social Science Education program or assessment of the other department's programs (history, geography, philosophy, and political science). The overriding questions, regardless of whose program is being discussed, include what are we doing well?, what do we need to do better?, and how can we do it better? As noted above, since the History/Government standards are due to be written within the next year, we do not want to revise the test until those have been approved.

Another issue related to our department content test that Social Science faculty will be discussing during the upcoming year is whether or not we want to require our Candidates to pass our department content test as a graduation/program requirement. Since our department content test is currently used to assess our program and not individual students, it has been suggested that some of the scores might be low because the students know they don't have to pass the test as a graduation or program requirement. If the faculty decide to add it as a graduation requirement, we will send the paperwork through the university's curriculum/program review process.

Regardless of the outcome of the upcoming assessment discussions and the revised department content test, the Social Science department is pleased overall with the results of the assessments used in this report to evaluate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of our program completers.

Attached Files

- [LAS-SS-SOCIAL SCIENCES-BSE](#)
- [a Hist Gov 2012 2013](#)
- [Attachment 1 A1 Praxis 2012 2013](#)
- [Attachment 2 A2 TWS Data 12 13](#)
- [Attachment 2a TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Attachment 3 A3 CT Eval Data](#)
- [Attachment 3a CT eval of ST](#)
- [Attachment 4 A4 TWS 2012 13](#)
- [Attachment 5 A5 SS Dept C Test 2012 13](#)
- [Attachment 6 A6 TRN Modules 12 13](#)
- [Attachment 6a TRNModulesrubric](#)
- [Attachment 7 A7 AH Research 12 13](#)
- [Attachment 7a AH Learning Outcomes Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 1 Praxis Content & PLT Scores for 5-8](#)
- [Assessment 2 TWS KTPT data for 5-8](#)
- [Assessment 3 CT Eval Data for 5-8](#)
- [Assessment 4 TWSKPTP data for 5-8](#)
- [Assessment 5 SS Dept Content Test Data for 5-8](#)
- [Assessment 6 Tchng SS Student Modules for 5-8](#)
- [Assessment 7 WH AH KSH Research Project for 5-8](#)
- [final narrative for 5-8](#)
- [5-8 History Government Socia Studies Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Praxis Content & PLT Scores for 5-8.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 TWS KTPT data for 5-8.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 CT Eval Data for 5-8.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 TWSKPTP data for 5-8.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Social Science Dept Content Test.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Tchng SS Student Modules for 5-8.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 SS Dept Content Test Data for 5-8.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Tchng SS Student Modules Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric for AH, WH, and KS History Research Paper.docx](#)

- [Assessment 7 WH AH KSH Research Project for 5-8.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE 5-8 History Government Socia Studies Report.docx](#)
- [Program of Study for 5-8 HistoryGovernmentSocial Studies.doc](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Table Praxis Content & PLT Scores.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table TWS KTPT.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table CT Eval.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table TWSKPTP.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Social Science Dept Content Test.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table SS Dept Content Test.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Tchng SS Student Modules.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 SS 310 Student Modules Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric for AH, WH, and KS History Research Paper.docx](#)
- [ESU KSDE History Govt Social Studies6-12 Template2015_OldStandards \(2\).docx](#)
- [Program of Study for 6-12 HistoryGovernmentSocial Studies .docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data TableWH AH KSH Research Project.doc](#)

Program Name: History BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The History BS/BA assessment information and reporting is now transitioned to the 5-Year Assessment Cycle Plan and information for this academic year and going forward is located in the 5-Year plan template.

AY 2017

This program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle and will be reporting assessment findings and improvement strategies accordingly.

AY 2016

The 2015-16 academic year marks the first time in history that all six historians used at least one variant of a standard rubric and returned the resulting data to the Department Chair for tabulation and analysis. By contrast, in 2014-15, only three historians had participated. The rubric was developed a few years earlier. The 100% participation in use of the rubrics is a remarkable step forward, and the end result is a large-N dataset that is ripe for a more comprehensive analysis than anything the Social Sciences Department has ever attempted before now. Because there are multiple versions of the rubric, not all questions have the same number of data points, but there are certain questions common to all versions. Overall, these results are by far the richest, most comprehensive assessment dataset ever produced for ESU's BS and BA programs in History. A copy of one of the more comprehensive versions of the rubric is attached to this report, as is a spreadsheet documenting the results.

The overall results, tabulated by student, produce an N of 192, though this varies from question to question due to the different versions of the rubric. Six instructors participated and nine courses were evaluated. With only slight rounding, the scores (on a scale of 0-5) on most questions produced means of at least 4. The three measures that fell below 4 on the 1-5 scale are attention to multicultural issues and diversity, organization of argument, and creating a well-substantiated argument with proper citation. These three areas are being flagged for extra attention in the 2016-17 academic year.

The results tabulated in Table 2 indicate that overall, the outcomes of our department's history courses are strong. Means fall significantly below 4 in only three areas: multicultural and diversity issues, organization of argument (not used on all rubrics), and well-substantiated argument/proper citation. Merging the second two areas into a single category, the action areas for history in 2016-17 become the following:

- Increase student awareness of multicultural and diversity issues
- Increase student mastery of making well-organized, well-substantiated arguments with proper citation

It is evident from a review of these charts that the lower means in the latter three areas charted are the results of slight shifts in student scores rather than radically different results. In other words, students were slightly more likely to score 4 (or 4.5) rather than 5 on the latter three areas, compared to the control. Likewise, they were more likely to score 3 (or 3.5) instead of 4, 2 (or 2.5) rather than 3, and so forth. The overall pattern of student performance compared to the control is remarkably similar, with the modal category being 4; the only difference is the slight shift downward in scores relative to the control. This suggests that the best approach to the areas being addressed in the coming year is to “beef up” coverage of multicultural and diversity issues and to emphasize making organized, well-substantiated, properly-cited arguments, rather than making radical shifts in instruction.

Additional Assessment Material

In addition to this data, a Saturday morning capstone session is conducted each year by the history faculty. This year, that capstone featured a multiple-choice exam as well as a project interpreting the meaning of a political cartoon. Results are as follows:

For the multiple choice answer:

Student 1: 4/5

Student 2: 5/5

Student 3: 5/5

Student 4: (No data)

Student 5: 3/5

Essay grades (out of 10):

8--correctly states what it says. Misses what it means.

7--mostly right; no interpretation.

8--great interpretation; misses basic identifications.

9--correctly states what it says; mostly correct on what it means. Fails to connect to date.

9.5--fails to identify which territories are under dispute; correct on what it means; connects to date.

The overall conclusion of this additional assessment material is that students may have some difficulty connecting the literal interpretation of certain primary source documents, with an interpretation of their meaning. The essay grades, in particular, highlight two students who correctly described the political cartoon in literal terms but offered incorrect or no interpretation, while three others did the reverse: offering strong interpretations but making omissions or errors in the factual description of the document.

Plans to address items flagged in the report

Faculty have advanced a number of thoughtful suggestions to address the areas flagged in this report. These include:

- Asking that all history faculty address multicultural/diversity issues in general education courses.
- For those faculty who regularly grade on rubrics in addition to this one, more-explicitly incorporate multicultural and diversity issues as a grading criterion on those other rubrics.
- Broadening the definition of multiculturalism and diversity to incorporate how different peoples see race (for example, in the different city-states of Ancient Greece) and the roles of women.
- Clarifying the definition of "multicultural diversity" in the rubric to be certain things like gender/sexual orientation/disability diversity are also included
- Use current events assignments to get students to make connections between the past and the present and encourage awareness of different cultures and interpretations of evidence
- Conduct "clinics" in proper thesis statement formulation
- Conduct "clinics" in proper reference to primary sources (using phrases like "according to" or "[x] suggests" or the like)
- Conduct "clinics" in Chicago Manual of Style footnote notation and use of the online Quick Guide
- Create an instructional video in Chicago Manual of Style for online courses, including graduate courses
- Embed more short assignments in courses like the one used for the essay assessment in the Saturday morning capstone—assignments which require students to simultaneously master the literal description of a document, and the interpretation of its deeper meaning.

Even a brief rubric or scoring guide for such an assignment may also help get students focused.

AY 2015

The primary means of assessment in History this year was a rubric given in general-education classes. Each history professor is asked to use this same rubric in his or her general education classes, collect the data, and return it to the Associate Chair and Chair. Each faculty member has the freedom to design an appropriate assignment which to grade using this rubric: one which is appropriate for that particular course. History also features a capstone course for graduating seniors.

This year, three faculty members completed and returned the rubrics for their general education history courses. Results are as follows:

- On the question, “frames a historical question in a thoughtful manner:”
 - 13/28 students (46%) showed excellent mastery
 - 14/28 students (50%) showed good mastery
 - 1/28 students (4%) showed some mastery
 - 0 students showed minimal or no mastery

- On the question regarding understanding of secondary sources:
 - 6/19 students (32%) showed excellent mastery
 - 10/19 students (53%) showed good mastery
 - 3/19 students (16%) showed some mastery
 - 0 students showed minimal or no mastery

- On the question regarding evaluation of primary sources:
 - 19/29 students (66%) showed excellent mastery
 - 8/29 students (28%) showed good mastery
 - 2/29 students (7%) showed some mastery
 - 0 students showed minimal or no mastery

- On the question regarding multicultural and diversity issues:
 - 13/22 students (59%) showed excellent mastery
 - 7/22 students (32%) showed good mastery
 - 2/22 students (9%) showed some mastery
 - 0 students showed minimal or no mastery

- On the question regarding a well-substantiated argument and proper citation:
 - 19/33 students (58%) showed excellent mastery
 - 12/33 students (36%) showed good mastery
 - 2/33 students (6%) showed some mastery
 - 0 students showed minimal or no mastery

These numbers paint a positive picture of the history program overall. For each question, a majority of students for whom rubrics were completed show either excellent or good mastery across the board. The numbers are just slightly lower for the question on secondary sources, but results are still solid. Faculty may wish to spend a bit of additional time discussing secondary sources—it is easy to imagine that with the history faculty’s very heavy emphasis on primary sources, secondary sources may not get quite as much discussion in class. Still, students excelled even on that question, with the excellent and good mastery categories combined accounting for 85% of results.

Moving forward, the primary concern for the history assessment is more faculty participation. Rubrics were returned this year by three faculty members. With a new hire this year, the full-time history faculty is now back up to six, plus a seventh on phased retirement for several more years. It is important that all seven administer these rubrics each semester. Furthermore, two different versions of the rubrics were used, leading to some questions not being asked of some students. Finally, some professors had students who did not complete the assignment, which led them to assign “zero” ratings to the students in each category. The zero ratings were not included in the totals listed above.

Goals for 2015-16:

- 100% use of the rubric in all general education courses
- All students complete the assignment so graded: faculty may have to raise the point total on the assignment so graded if necessary in order to ensure that all students complete it.
- Each faculty member use the same rubric

- Slightly greater emphasis on the appropriate use of secondary sources

Longer-term, the History faculty plans to re-write the rubric once the state's new standards for teaching history are introduced in the next few years, because this rubric is also used for Social Sciences Education assessment.

Attached Files

[LAS-SS-HISTORY-BA BS](#)

Program Name: History MA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The History MA assessment information and reporting is now transitioned to the 5-Year Assessment Cycle Plan and information for this academic year and going forward is located in the 5-Year plan template.

AY2017

This program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle and will be reporting assessment findings and improvement strategies accordingly.

AY2016

Last year, the sudden departure of the faculty member tasked with graduate program assessment left the department with only a "Coming Soon" note and future plans in the annual assessment report. This is no longer an issue. Assessment is back on track in our graduate programs.

The department has data for two students who completed their graduate degrees in 2015-16. Of course, this small-N means that statistical analyses are meaningless, but a look at the data points the way to some valuable insights.

The first student for whom data was reported completed his history thesis during this past year. Assessment sheets were completed by all three of his committee members. Means ranged from 4.33 to 5 on a 0-5 scale in all categories, leaving no concerns.

The second student under scrutiny marks a milestone: the last student to graduate from the Department's now-defunct MAT program. Once again, in all categories studied, the student demonstrated mastery, with scores ranging from 26.33 on a scale of 0-30 for social sciences content, to 11.5 on a 1-12 scale measuring self-reflection. Again, all three committee members completed the assessment instrument.

One rather puzzling thing to emerge from the MAT assessment is that the ten categories measured are not scaled the same way. All categories begin at 0 but their high points range from 5 for use of technology, to 30 on the social sciences content and organization scales. This instrument will not be used again due the program's last student having graduated, but it is worth noting for the future that assessment is more straightforward if the same numerical scale is used for all measurements. I (the department chair and author of this report) was not serving as chair when this instrument was designed and I do not know why it was designed this way, but with this degree program and assessment instrument now set to be retired, it is best to avoid such awkward designs in the future. The current M.A. thesis/project assessment instrument does use a common 0-5 scale for all categories measured.

While they pertain to different degree programs (M.A. vs. MAT) and use different instruments, these two completed assessment instruments indicate successful students and successful degree programs, with no trouble spots. A second evaluation, the use of a rubric to evaluate the performance of 7 students in a graduate course, also produced high means with no areas of concern.

In terms of areas for improvement, what stands out is the use of the assessment instruments by faculty. The M.A. program is still in its first five years of transition to its new degree "tracks" (including a Social Sciences Education track that replaced the MAT). Faculty appear to be unaware that the M.A. assessment sheet applies to all four tracks—the Social Sciences Education and Public History tracks, which require projects, and the exams option, as well as the thesis. While only one thesis student graduated during this period and was assessed, another student graduated after completing a public history project, and no assessment rubrics were returned for him. In the future, the Department Chair will insure that faculty know that the rubrics are to be used for exams and projects, not just theses.

This is the only trouble spot notable from the graduate program assessment, given that the MAT program and instrument are being retired. All students who were assessed returned excellent performance in all categories measured, so no concerns there.

AY 2015

No assessment was done on the History MA program this year, for two reasons. First, it is a revamped program, having just transitioned to

being all-online and incorporated the old MAT degree into a new Social Sciences Education track. New means of assessment are needed for the program, given these changes. Second, the faculty member tasked with assessing the MA resigned from Emporia State mid-year to take a new job. The History faculty need to design and implement new measures of assessment for the revamped MA program, in 2015-16.

Attached Files

[LAS-SS-HISTORY-MA](#)

Program Name: Political Science BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The Political Science BS/BA assessment information and reporting is now transitioned to the 5-Year Assessment Cycle Plan and information for this academic year and going forward is located in the 5-Year plan template.

AY 2017

This program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle and will be reporting assessment findings and improvement strategies accordingly.

AY 2016

Section One: Survey Questions

In a survey we asked 15 questions about the Political Science Program (see the attached questions and their results). We had ten participants in this survey. Overall the response ranged from “strongly agree” to “somewhat agree”, while three responses were “not applicable”. Three responses to question eleven were over “advising me appropriately on courses and program requirements.” However, some students do not meet with their advisors, even though we strongly recommend they do. As advisors we do tell them to be proactive throughout their tenure at ESU. Concerning the political Science Program we give them the pamphlet that explains the requirements, including the general education requirements. In addition, as advisors we always do a graduation evaluation with our students before we advise them. Overall, the students that participate in the survey gave very strong responses to the program.

Section Two: Learning Outcomes Rubric

This year, the political science program replaced its longstanding multiple-choice assessment exam with a new rubric-graded assignment. Instead of holding a single, Saturday morning “capstone” session, we embedded this rubric in one of the methods courses taught to junior and senior political science majors. A copy of the rubric is attached to this report.

The rubric was adapted from the one used by the history program for the last several years, and contained five parts: Student frames a question about political science in a thoughtful manner; Student conducts original data collection in such a way as to show mastery of a political science methodology; Student analyzes their data in such a way to show mastery of political science methodology; Mechanics of writing; and Well-substantiated argument with proper citation of evidence. The term projects that were used in this section came from PO 500 Quantitative Research Methods in Political Science. In this case we had ten projects that we evaluated. It ranged from “excellent mastery” (5pts) to “no mastery” (0pts). Overall there was a total of 25 points. The scores ranged from 25 to 7 points. Out of ten participants the average was 19.7. Two students did not participate in class, meaning that they missed a lot of class. In addition they did their projects at the last minute. The project is all semester long.

Section Three: Breakdown of Results

Below are the results for the rubric scores. Means for the students were above four in all but one category: Writing Mechanics. As a result, the political scientists have labeled writing mechanics our “action area” for 2015-16. *Note:* regarding the criteria below, there are no categories B or E. This is because the political scientists adapted the history rubric, and kept the letters denoting the categories in that longer rubric, to make cross-disciplinary comparisons more feasible in the future.

Action Plan for 2016-17

The focus for 2016-17 will be improvement of student performance on writing mechanics. The political science faculty agreed to the following two items, to be used in all courses in which writing assignments are given, in the 2016-17 academic year. This includes everything from short, in-class writing assignments to long term papers, and applies to both online and on-campus classes.

1. All assignments will include the following language: “Remember—an essay must include proper spelling, grammar, and punctuation, complete sentences and paragraphs, at least one topic sentence, and at least one concluding sentence.”

2. Guided by the language above, faculty will provide more detailed feedback to students on each writing assignment as regards the quality of their writing mechanics in the essay being graded.
3. All major term papers and projects will be written in at least two drafts. The three political science professors will assign the deadline for the first draft early enough that when turned in on time, the professor will have time to put comments on it and return it to the student for a redraft. The redraft will be the final paper/project. Some professors may choose to assign more than two drafts but two is the minimum. This applies only to major, term-length assignments and to both online and on-campus courses

AY 2015

Political Science assessment consists of two parts: a multiple-choice exit exam and a capstone essay. The multiple choice exam asks questions on a variety of topics covering the four subfields of political science: American politics, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory (philosophy). There are also questions about research methodology.

Results of the multiple choice exam ranged from 19 (57%) to 26 (79%). Most-missed questions concerned the ordinal level of measurement, theories of Latin American politics, sources of revenue for state governments, and U.S. Constitutional guarantees to the states. These results merit more emphasis on the relevant material in research methods and state and local government classes, both required of majors. The question about Latin American politics is vague and may need to be rewritten for the next year.

One notable concern is the student scoring only 19 on this exam. This student was a triple-major who was granted numerous course substitutions in order to add the political science major to her resume. This large list of course substitutions may have resulted in having gaps in her political science education. In the future, a student a similar situation might be better-advised to pursue a political science minor rather than a third major.

The essay portion required students to read an article applying the international relations theory of “shatterbelts” to the Ukraine. One student truly excelled on the essay, showing a true mastery of the relevant theories and applying them well to analyze the Ukraine’s current political predicament. A second essay mentioned a number of relevant international relations concepts but did not grapple with the concept of shatterbelts, which was the article’s focus. Two additional essays featured little discussion of the article at all, instead speculating on the dangers of U.S. military intervention in the region, which was not a key part of the article.

Overall, the essay portion of the assessment was a disappointment, with the majority of students not taking the assignment seriously— three of the four essays showed little engagement with the assigned reading.

For the future, political science faculty will consider abandoning the “capstone” model in favor of embedding the assessment into a class. The capstone course is zero credit hours and graded pass/fail, leaving students little incentive to excel. Embedding the essay into a class and grading it on an A-F scale would give students more incentive to take the assignment seriously.

For 2014-15, the political scientists plan to do the following:

- More emphasis on levels of measurement (nominal, ordinal, interval, ratio) in PO 500: Quantitative Research Methods
- Re-write the Latin American Theories question on the assessment exam
- More emphasis on the U.S. Constitution’s guarantees to the states and on sources of state revenue in PO 322: State and Local Government
- “Embed” the capstone essay into a class taught mostly to seniors, instead of having it be part of a zero-credit-hour course. The most-obvious candidates for embedding are PO 500 or PO 501: Qualitative Research Methods. It is important that the essay be graded on an A-F scale, not simply pass/fail.
- For students interested in the political science major as a 2nd or 3rd major, assess whether or not it is realistic for them to take the required courses and avoid making more than a few course substitutions. If this is not feasible, consider recruiting them as political science minors instead.

Attached Files

- [History gen ed rubric](#)
- [HI Assessment 15-16](#)
- [History gen ed rubric](#)

- [Political Science Learning Outcomes Rubric data 2016 nameless](#)
- [Political science rubric edited](#)
- [Social sciences assessment 2016](#)
- [Attachment 1 A1 Praxis 2014 2015](#)
- [Attachment 5 A5 SS Dept C Test 2014 15](#)
- [Social Science Dept Content Test](#)
- [2014 15 Hist Gov Program Report](#)
- [Social sciences assessment 2017.docx](#)
- [2017 Econ Questions for Social Science Content Test.docx](#)
- [2017 Political Science Learning Outcomes Rubric data nameless.xlsx](#)
- [Curric Maps 2017 History.docx](#)
- [Curric Maps 2017 Poli Sci.docx](#)
- [HI Assessment 2017.xlsx](#)
- [Curric Maps 2017 History.docx](#)
- [Curric Maps 2017 Poli Sci.docx](#)

Providing Department: Social Sciences

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Responsible Roles:

Maire Johnson (e11092868), John Barnett (E10322801), Darla Mallein (E10088379), Michael Smith (E10000203), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Political Science BS/BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

AY 2018

Political Science completed curriculum maps this semester using our new SLOs, adopted last year. The maps are in an attached file, labeled accordingly. This mapping plus data provided to us by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness allowed us to assess our program this year, even though it was an "off year" for our two capstone classes: PO 500 and PO 501. This year's assessment data is cumulative for the last several years. A detailed breakdown of the courses used for assessment, the SLOs, and the results, is attached as a spreadsheet.

This long-term, cumulative assessment, along with our new curriculum maps, allow the Political Science faculty to get a bigger picture of our program's strengths. After two years of intensive work to re-vamp nearly everything about assessment in Political Science, culminating in two assessment champion awards, this year allows us to take a break while still assessing the broader picture.

In general, these assessments depict a very strong program. No areas for concern are evident. Instead, the political scientists propose to continue the course set in AY 2017, which is to focus on writing skills (SLO 4). This was the area identified as needing the most work in AY 2016, and the new approaches implemented in AY 2017 showed solid growth in student performance. SLO 4 will be assessed again in AY 2019, and the faculty commit to continuing the practices of having students write major papers in multiple drafts with faculty feedback on each draft, as well as using common core language for what constitute minimum criteria for good writing, which have shown quick, positive changes in student performance in the last two years. We look forward to re-visiting assessment again next year and tracking our progress in this and all other SLOs.

Results for this year's assessment are as follows:

SLO 1: Frames question thoughtfully

N = 1856

Exceeds Expectations: 75%

Meets Expectations: 15%

{Meets/Exceeds Combined}: 90%

Expectations Not Met: 10%

Mean = 2.65/3

SLO 2: Data Collection

N = 27

Exceeds Expectations: 81%

Meets Expectations: 7%

{Meets/Exceeds Combined}: 88%

Expectations Not Met: 11%

Mean = 2.7/3

SLO 3: Data Analysis

N = 47

Exceeds Expectations: 89%

Meets Expectations: 6%

{Meets/Exceeds Combined}: 95%

Expectations Not Met: 4%

Mean = 2.8/3

SLO 4: *Not assessed this year but will be assessed again in AY 2019 when PO 500 and PO 501 are offered again on their two-year rotations.*

SLO 5: Well-substantiated argument

N = 374

Exceeds Expectations: 76%

Meets Expectations: 15%

{Meets/Exceeds Combined}: 91%

Expectations Not Met: 9%

Mean = 2.68/3

AY 2017

Political Science

Section One: Survey Questions

In a survey we asked 15 questions about the Political Science Program (see the attached questions and their results). The survey is not always given to seniors in their 2nd semester, because it is administered in classes taught on two-year cycles. Sometimes a student completes the survey in the junior year instead, due to the course rotation. As a result, while we had 10 completed surveys last year, we had only two in 2016-17—this does not reflect our number of majors in the program. Both students completing the survey gave the program and faculty very high marks, noting that it was particularly strong in developing research and writing skills. The students liked all their courses, but suggested that the major offer more discussion-centered classes.

Section Two: Learning Outcomes Rubric

This year, political science aligned its learning outcomes with the rubric adopted in 2015-16. The rubric was used for the 2nd time, producing remarkable results—among the 9 students’ final papers that were analyzed, the means on all five learning outcomes measured were above 4 on a 1-5 scale. Each student paper was evaluated separately by two faculty members on the rubric, producing a test for intercoder reliability. The two faculty members often gave students the same evaluations. Where they differed, it was only by 1—occasionally one professor would rate a student a “4” in a given category, while the other rated that same student a “5” in that category, or one would give a “3,” the other, a “4.” On only one outcome, for one student, did the faculty rating vary by more than 1—Student 9 (names removed for anonymity) earned a “5” for Original data collection from one faculty member, but only a 3 from the other. However, this was the only such discrepancy in the dataset.

The political science results are particularly remarkable because last year, student means were significantly below “4” on one category—a 3.4 in writing mechanics. This year, the mean is 4.17 in that category. The political scientists are hopeful that the new writing protocols adopted for this year, helped bring about this change. That protocol is to have all major student papers written in multiple drafts, with faculty feedback on each draft. Also, the political scientists agreed on standardized, simplified language to describe expectations of good writing: complete sentences and paragraphs, proper spelling, grammar, and punctuation, citation of any quotes or ideas from others, at least one topic sentence, and at least one concluding sentence. We plan to continue this new regimen and it appears to be paying dividends.

Attached Files

- [LAS-SS-POLITICAL SCIENCE-BA-BS](#)
- [2017 Political Science Learning Outcomes Rubric data nameless](#)
- [LAS-SS-Political Science-BA-BS Revised 2017](#)
- [Political science rubric edited](#)
- [Curric Maps 2017 Poli Sci.docx](#)
- [Political Science BA BS 2018.xlsx](#)
- [Brown-Charles-PI225-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Kelly-Phil-PO100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Kelly-Phil-PO444-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Kelly-Phil-PO330-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Smith-Michael-PO322-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Smith-Michael-PO406-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Smith-Michael-PO446-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Attached Files

- [2017 Political Science Learning Outcomes Rubric data nameless](#)
- [Political science rubric edited](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Political Science BS/BA

Responsible Roles: Michael Smith (E10000203)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

History BS/BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

AY 2018

This year, the History program began using a new, streamlined set of SLOs. They also mapped their courses, and the maps are given in an accompanying document. There was nearly 100% faculty compliance in using the SLOs and the scoring guides prepared for assessing them. Results are provided in the two attached Spreadsheets: History BA BS Fall 2017 Compiled Assessments, and the same for Spring 2018. The results are tabulated below this narrative.

Students ranked strongly in all 5 new SLOs. The percentages of High Proficiency/Proficiency combined ranged from 86% (SLO 4,

Communicates Effectively, Spring 18) down to 71% (SLO 5, Diversity, Fall 17). Means ranged from 3.5 down to 3.01.

The lowest-scoring area identified is multicultural and diversity issues. For AY 2019, the History faculty plans to address this.

SLO 1: Explains historical developments in Kansas, American, European and/or World History

N=370 Fall 17, 343 Spring 18

High Proficiency=46% Fall 17, 55% Spring 18

Proficiency=31% Fall 17, 20% Spring 18

{High Proficiency and Proficiency Combined} = 78% Fall 17, 75% Spring 18

Limited Proficiency=15% Fall 17, 16% Spring 18

Deficient=9% Fall 17, 9% Spring 18

Mean = 3.14 Fall 17, 3.21 Spring 18

SLO 2: Explains how knowledge/evidence can be subject to numerous interpretations

N=214 Fall 17, 284 Spring 18

High Proficiency=39% Fall 17, 60% Spring 18

Proficiency=34% Fall 17, 23% Spring 18

{High Proficiency/Proficiency Combined}=73% Fall 17, 83% Spring 18

Limited Proficiency=19% Fall 17, 12% Spring 18

Deficient=8% Fall 17, 6% Spring 18

Mean = 3.03 Fall 17, 3.37 Spring 18

SLO 3: Analyzes primary and/or secondary sources

N=338 Fall 17, 328 Spring 18

High Proficiency=43% Fall 17, 52% Spring 18

Proficiency=33% Fall 17, 33% Spring 18

{High Proficiency/Proficiency Combined}=76% Fall 17, 85% Spring 18

Limited Proficiency=18% Fall 17, 9% Spring 18

Deficient=5% Fall 17, 5% Spring 19

Mean = 3.14 Fall 17, 3.32 Spring 18

SLO 4: Communicates effectively orally and/or in writing, as appropriate to the discipline of history

N=287 Fall 17, 334 Spring 18

High Proficiency=67% Fall 17, 65% Spring 18

Proficiency=20% Fall 17, 21% Spring 18

{High Proficiency/Proficiency Combined}=80% Fall 17, 86% Spring 18

Limited Proficiency=7% Fall 17, 10% Spring 18

Deficient=5% Fall 17, 3% Spring 18

Mean = 3.5 Fall 17, 3.49 Spring 18

SLO 5: Distinguishes and analyzes multicultural and/or diversity issues

N=246 Fall 17, 304 Spring 18

High Proficiency=49% Fall 17, 39% Spring 18

Proficiency=22% Fall 17, 33% Spring 18

{High Proficiency/Proficiency Combined}=71% Fall 17, 72% Spring 18

Limited Proficiency=18% Fall 17, 19% Spring 18

Deficient=11% Fall 17, 10% Spring 18

Mean = 3.10 Fall 17, 3.01 Spring 18

AY 2017

The high level of compliance in 2015-16 and again in 2016-17 produced a rich dataset that allowed for statistical tests to be run on the data. The results are encouraging. The means were significantly below 4.0 on only two categories: organization of argument (mean = 3.68) and writing mechanics (mean = 3.85). Furthermore, three categories showed statistically-significant changes from last year (using a two-tailed t-test), and all three were in the positive direction. *Primary sources: evaluate/analyze* rose from 3.97 to 4.15, *Well substantiated argument/proper citation* rose from 3.73 to 3.99, and *Multicultural/diversity* increased from 3.76 to 4.11. All three changes were significant at the 0.05 level.

Recommendations: The history program is showing strong growth in measured outcomes. The areas that lag slightly behind involve writing and composition mechanics, not historiography. Political science featured a similar problem last year. The political scientists' response: requiring students to submit all major assignments in multiple drafts with professor comments on each draft, and adopting standardized language for all writing assignments, seem to have produced dividends. It may not be feasible for the historians to have students write papers in multiple drafts in high-enrollment general-education courses, but the historians are encouraged to consider doing so in upper-division offerings. They may also wish to consider adopting the common language for good writing used by the political scientists, which is as typed below. Allowing for slight variation, this standard language allows for brief, clearly articulated expectations of good writing without getting into the arcane details of various stylebooks, yet allows the professor to reference the stylebook of his or her choice (MLA, APA, Chicago, Turabian, etc.) without compromising the general language. The language is as follows:

- *Good essays require proper spelling, grammar, and punctuation, complete sentences and paragraphs, at least one topic sentence, at least one concluding sentence, and proper citation of any quotes or ideas that come from others.*

Note: New SLOs have been designed and approved for the History major. A new curriculum map is forthcoming in Fall, 2017.

Attached Files

- [HI Assessment 2017 Undergrad N means](#)
- [History Assessment Data Entry](#)
- [History Proposed Student Learning Outcomes for History Discipline](#)
- [History SLO 4-oral](#)
- [History SLO 4-written](#)
- [History SLO 2](#)
- [History SLO 1](#)
- [History SLO 3](#)
- [History gen ed rubric](#)
- [LAS-SS-HISTORY-BA-BS](#)
- [HI Assessment 2017 Undergrad N means](#)
- [HI Assessment 2017 Undergrad worksheet 2](#)
- [HI Assessment 2017 Undergrad worksheet](#)
- [History gen ed rubric old](#)
- [History SLO 1](#)
- [History SLO 2](#)

- [History SLO 3](#)
- [History SLO 4-oral](#)
- [History SLO 4-written](#)
- [Curric Maps 2017 History.docx](#)
- [History BA BS Fall 2017 Compiled Assessments.xlsx](#)
- [History BA BS Spring 2018 Compiled Assessments.xlsx](#)
- [Johnson-Maire-HI101-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Johnson-Maire-HI314-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Johnson-Maire-HI300-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Johnson-Maire-HI101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Johnson-Maire-HI499-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Lovett-Christopher-HI319-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Johnson-Maire-HI313-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Lovett-Christopher-HI102-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miracle-Amanda-HI111-SP18.pdf](#)
- [O'Keefe-Dillon-HI111-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Miracle-Amanda-HI302-SP18.pdf](#)
- [O'Keefe-Dillon-HI112-FA17.pdf](#)
- [O'Keefe-Dillon-HI112-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Lovett-Christopher-HI451-SP18.pdf](#)
- [O'Keefe-Dillon-HI343-SP18.pdf](#)
- [O'Keefe-Dillon-HI498-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Schneider-Gregory-HI301-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Schneider-Gregory-HI347-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hann-Debbie-GE101-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: History BS/BA

Responsible Roles: Michael Smith (E10000203)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

History MA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress:

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

AY 2018

In preparing the assessment of the M.A. program this year, we discovered a significant concern: only two students graduated from this program in AY 2018, only one of whom (the thesis student) was assessed. There are approximately 20 students currently enrolled in the program.

As a result, a series of conversations ensued between the Department Chair, Graduate Director, Graduate Dean, LA&S Dean, and History faculty to design a comprehensive plan to raise graduation rates.

The single student that was assessed performed well, earning a mean of 4/5 in all categories assessed by three reviewers. Thus, the quality of this student's work is not a concern, instead, the focus is on raising graduation rates and assessing all students.

To that end, the History faculty, Department Chair, Graduate Director, Graduate Dean, and LA & S Dean have all agreed to and will implement the following plan in AY 2018:

Proposed Changes to the History M.A. Program, 2018-19

1. All incoming History M.A. students will now start on either the Exams or the Social Sciences Education track, depending on their application. If no preference was expressed, the student will be on the Exams track.

2. Students wishing to be on the Thesis track must petition to do so by the conclusion of 9 hours.

The petition must include:

- a) The official thesis prospectus
- b) A writing sample, and
- c) A proposed thesis committee chair who has agreed to serve in this role.

The Graduate Director and the proposed Thesis Committee Chair will decide whether or not to approve the petition. Both must favor approval for it to be accepted. If the petition is rejected or incomplete, the student remains on the Exams track.

1) GTAs are expected to take a minimum of 6 credit hours per semester and may be funded for up to 6 semesters (excluding summer), depending on availability of funding. No student will be awarded a GTAship for more than 6 semesters (excluding summer) in the History M.A. program. Students otherwise qualified may be on any of the three tracks (Exams, Thesis, or Social Sciences Education) and serve as GTAs. A GTA is not required to write a thesis.

2) GTAs on the thesis track must schedule a defense by the beginning of their 6th semester (excluding summer), or they will automatically revert to the exams track. The student is not required to have actually defended by the beginning of the 6th semester, only to have the defense date set.

3) A common assessment instrument will be used for all students—exams, social sciences education, and thesis—and the data will be provided to the Chair for the annual assessment report. This instrument will be based on the rubric currently being used for thesis students.

4) As of Fall, 2018, the M.A. no longer has a public history track. Instead, we now have an approved Graduate Certificate in Public History, which may be studied separately or paired with any of the three remaining tracks of the M.A. Public history requires on-campus study and is advised by Dr. Thierer. The new graduate certificate in Public History is not a teacher-credentialing program and does not compete with our Graduate Certificate in History for teachers.

AY 2017

History: Graduate

The History M.A. assessment featured 18 cases—too few for statistical tests, but enough to produce rich results. Using a similar rubric as the undergraduate program, graduate assessment produced means well above 4 in all categories. There were no areas of concern to flag. The lowest-scoring categories were Well substantiated argument/proper citation and Organization of Argument, both tied at 4.11, while the highest-scoring was Key historical events/facts at 4.61.

Again, there are absolutely no areas of concern from the History assessment this year. The slightly lower scores regarding paper-writing skills (technically, the two lowest means are the only ones that would correspond to A- rather than A grades on an A-F scale with pluses and minuses) indicate that some students could use just a bit more help on their writing skills, but this is a minor concern at most. The assessment results for the History graduate program are strong.

Attached Files

- [HI Assessment 2017 Grad N means](#)
- [LAS-SS-HISTORY-MA](#)
- [HI Assessment 2017 Grad N means](#)
- [MA assessment 2018.docx](#)
- [Lovett-Christopher-HI710-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miracle-Amanda-HI503-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miracle-Amanda-HI815-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Schneider-Gregory-HI702-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

AY 2018

Only one student assessed--see above under "Year 1-4, Annual Assessment and Planning."

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: History MA

Responsible Roles: Michael Smith (E10000203)

UNIT REPORT

**Sociology, Anthropology, and Crime & Delinquency Studies
Assessment Report 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:15 AM

**Sociology, Anthropology, and Crime and Delinquency Studies Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

For AY 2018, the department decided to: (1) Add SO400 [Family in Social Context] as a substitute/alternative to the required AN315 [Family in Cross Cultural Perspective] The analysis of the course evaluations for AN315 indicated that this course meets the academic interests of students interested in anthropology but not those of our sociology majors. (2) The curricula will be changed from the current required 124 credit hours to 120 credit hours. This reduction won't affect the required hours for the majors or the required general education credits. It will also align our programs with the KBOR minimum of 120 Hrs. (3) Data from the following courses will be collected for program assessment this year: Independent Study, Practicum, and Capstone. (4) I am currently working on a plan to have a faculty retreat during the Spring semester to take a close look at the current curricula to identify areas in need of improvement, to delineate an assessment plan for the future, and revise the department mission and vision statements. Alumni and employers from the community will be invited as guest speakers to gather information that will assist us in aligning our programs with the social service employment needs of the community.

AY 2017

During the 2017 academic year the department decided to: (1) modify the interdisciplinary requirement for the CDS major. Originally, CDS majors were required to take 6-hrs from courses from other departments but they were to select courses from a prescribed list of courses. It became evident that given the fact that some of the courses listed (a) were not offered on a regular basis, (b) changed titles or course numbers, or (c) were not of interest for the CDS majors, and (2) have 1 faculty member responsible for teaching the newly implemented Capstone Course (SO580). Initially two faculty members were assigned to teach a small section of the course with 7-8 students per section. This strategy turned out to be inefficient and unpractical in part because each assigned faculty had their own vision and goals for the course. It was agreed that since this was an experimental course/cohort of students, it would be more beneficial to have one person teach the course sections and conduct the assessment.

Dr. Rowley recruited a group of students to assist her in conducting a feasibility study to determine the feasibility of implementing a masters program in applied sociology. The project will continue next year with the expectation of having a preliminary/draft proposal by the end of the academic year.

The faculty participated in the "Planning and Implementing Course Embedded Assessment" professional development workshop on Wednesday, March 1. Based on the feedback I received from the faculty, the workshop was very informative and helped in implementing embedded assessment into their courses (general education and program). There was a consensus that some of the ideas and strategies explained during the training, the faculty already have them in place. The next step will be to develop a mechanism to better report the data to the Chair. Our goal will be to develop a committee for this particular task next year.

AY 2016

During the 2016 academic year we implemented a new instrument to assess faculty's views of their performance to be used as part of the annual faculty evaluation. It consisted of a form document which asked faculty to address the following questions: "Reflect on your Teaching (not including advising) over the past year and answer any or all of following questions. How were you effective in your teaching? What worked and what didn't work? What did you try differently? What would you do the same or differently next year? What were some of the challenges? What would you like to improve? What worked well? What teaching ideas would you like to share with your colleagues?" Based on the responses received, it is evident that our faculty members are committed to improving their teaching skills and techniques. The following comments capture the faculty's commitment to their profession and with improving student learning. "Although I have taught this course many times I think this semester has found the right mix of readings, in class activities, on-line assignments and content. I can see that the students appreciate a more dynamic approach to class material and presentation and I intend to follow this model in AN 210 and other future courses. What worked the best for me was to assign a book and readings that were moving and appealing to me and then leave

plenty of class time to read and discuss. I did this in the middle of the semester instead of the end and the timing worked very well. I had enough time to prep the students for the reading and then unpack without feeling rushed at the end of the semester. Also, instead of lecturing over a text, I had the students read a chapter per week and then take an online quiz over the material. That seemed to work well also." "The move away from examinations to in-class discussions and activities has been extremely effective. Students are more engaged in their own learning and indicate they enjoy what is done in class. Most of my adjustments have been in assignment instructions, in-class activity choices, and providing options for the final assessment. So far, these adjustments have been met with approval by the students. The biggest teaching strategy I would like to share is that of letting go of control of the class. Lectures create a clear hierarchy in the classroom that many students don't particularly care for. Allowing more interaction from students and allowing for creativity spurs interest and a desire to learn more. One initiative I will NEVER do again is teach 7 courses in one semester while also having all of my other responsibilities." "If there was a clear factor which I emphasized, and continue to emphasize, in my classes was the effort to make sure that the students connected with the issues discussed – specifically, in terms of their being able to see how sociological or anthropological concepts connect with, and can be illustrated in, our daily experiences. I also tried, as I always have, to generate class discussion, while injecting a degree of informality in class discussion, which seemed to be effective."

AY 2015

The department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Crime and Delinquency Studies has undergone change over the past Academic Year 2015 with the unplanned departure of the chair in January of 2015. The interim chair and department faculty worked to identify the priorities for the assessment planning and curriculum mapping as per the direction of the Student Learning Assessment Council of which the chair is a member. In response, the department confirmed its mission, program goals and objectives, general education contributions, and teaching staff composition. Learning outcomes assessments were identified including direct and indirect measures and a timeline for implementation of the plan was identified. The evidence document is attached below.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

A departmental retreat took place on January 19, 2018 from 8am to 4pm at the University Memorial Union. The faculty received an overview of the state of the department (e.g., enrollment patterns, statistics on the number of minors, majors, retention and graduation rates, etc.). Dr. Jo Kord spoke about the importance of getting the faculty engaged in general education and program assessment. Dr. Shelly Gherke explained recruitment and retention statistics, and provided insights on strategists to improve retention and recruitment in our programs. Dr. Gary Wyatt was the retreat facilitator.

Retreat Findings:

- With the assistance of Dr. Wyatt, the faculty drafted a Vision for the Department: "The Department Thrives to Be Recognized as a Leader in Preparing Students as Agents of Social Change."

The Faculty revised the Department mission statement as follows:

OLD Mission Statement (2009): "The mission of the department is to provide students with an educational experience that will assist them in analyzing, and understanding human behavior and social arrangements. Through completing the curriculum and engaging discipline-based scholarly activities, students will develop and sharpen academic knowledge and skills, and by so doing complete preparation for careers, graduate studies, and informed citizenship in a global society. Consistent with the university's student centered mission, the department is committed to academic excellence, community and global involvement and professional fulfillment. (Approve 2009).

NEW Mission Statement (2018): "We Prepare Students as Agents of Social Change."

- A new concentration in Correctional Services will be created within the CDS program to better prepare students interested in pursuing a career in the corrections field (e.g., probation, parole, prison, jail). A proposal already is in progress to get it approved and implemented during the 2018-2019 semester.
- The group identified increasing collaboration between our CDS program and the MA in Forensic Sciences. Two courses will be offered for graduate credit: Forensic Anthropology and Drugs: Society and the Body.
- The panel of employers and internship supervisors identified several areas in need of attention in our programs and college in general: (1) students' written and oral skills and (2) self-presentation (lack of confidence). We will be looking at the possibility of addressing these deficiencies through the Capstone or by offering SO440 Professional Development sometime in the future.
- The undergraduate teaching/research assistantship program has been (informally) in place for about 2 years, and will be formalized

during the 2018-2019 AY.

AY 2017

Summary, Strategies, and Outcomes

During the 2017 academic year faculty and students engaged in series of activities all of which in one way another contributed to achieving departmental goals, and enhanced student learning through high impact learning activities.

- Like in 2016, faculty compliance with the University policy that all syllabi include student learning outcomes was successfully implemented during the academic year with 100% compliance rate.
- Two honor (AKD) students presented a poster at a regional sociology conference in Milwaukee.
- Three students attended the Kansas Collegiate Law Enforcement Academy in Salina, Kansas. This an annual event sponsored by the KS Highway Patrol academy for prospective law enforcement officers.
- One of our majors won the Research and Creativity People's Choice Award during the Research and Creativity Day event.
- A faculty member received a grant from the Koch Center for Leadership & Ethics Faculty Grants during the Spring 2017. This spring semester the students in the Ethics in Criminal Justice class worked on and presented debates about different ethical situations in the criminal justice field. Subjects such as excessive force, blue code of silence and police corruption were some of the 10 different debates presented throughout the end of the semester. This project meets/fits our departmental learning goal 3.5 and 3.3. in the sociology and CDS programs respectively (Be informed about the American Sociological Association's Code of Ethics, and other professional codes of conducts in the social service field.)
- The Sociology Club remained actively engaged on campus and in the community in events such as volunteering for Big Brothers and Big Sisters Gift Wrapping, participating in Major-in-Minutes, and organizing a panel on violent crime prevention.
- AKD Sociology Honor Society members sponsor recruitment and retention events for our majors and a panel discussion on poverty in Uganda. They also attended the Midwest Sociological Society meeting in Milwaukee.
- Dr. Camara was promoted to full professor, and is working on a book manuscript.
- Dr. Rowley received the ESU Ruth Schillinger Award. "The award is given to an individual who has made extraordinary contributions to the women of Emporia State over a sustained period of time."

AY 2016

Summary, Strategies, and Outcomes

I am pleased to report the following activities during the academic year, all of which in one way another contributed to achieving departmental goals, and enhanced student learning through high impact learning activities.

- Faculty compliance with the University policy that all syllabi include student learning outcomes was successfully implemented during the academic year 2016 with 100% compliance rate.
- Two honor (AKD) students presented a poster at a regional sociology conference in Chicago, IL.
- Two students attended the Kansas Collegiate Law Enforcement Academy in Salina, Kansas. This an annual event sponsored by the KS Highway Patrol academy for prospective law enforcement officers.
- Approximately 10 students presented their research projects during the annual ESU Research and Creativity Day at the Memorial Union.
- A faculty member received a grant from the Koch Center for Leadership & Ethics Faculty Grants during the Spring 2016. The grant was used to engage students in her Street Crime and White-Collar Crime class in an investigation of illegal dumping of toxic material by a fictitious corporation. The main purpose of the project was for students to identify the social conditions under which personal and collective decisions are made, with an emphasis on ethical values as a mechanism of personal and social control. The project was very well received by students. This project meets/fits our departmental learning goal 3.5 and 3.3. in the sociology and CDS programs respectively (Be informed about the American Sociological Association's Code of Ethics, and other professional codes of conducts in the social service field.)
- The Sociology Club sponsored the Out of the Darkness Campus Walk April 2016. Over \$10,000 was raised and over 400 people attended and they presented the documentary Hunting Ground to raise awareness of sexual assault on college campuses.
- AKD Sociology Honor Society members collected donations for children in Uganda. The project was part of instructor David Westfall's Summer trip to Uganda to assist with the day-to-day operations of M-Lisada Orphanage. Two sociology majors will be working in Uganda as part of the project.
- One faculty member published two research articles and another faculty published three articles all of which are related to their teaching areas.

- One faculty member received the ESU Excellence in Academic Advising Award.
- The department sponsored a self-defense workshop for the entire campus. About 10 CDS majors attended the workshop.
- The department supported an experimental project which allowed a qualified undergraduate student to serve as a teaching assistant for Introduction to Sociology and Intimate Relations courses.
- The department hired a new tenure-track faculty member whose areas of expertise include criminology, gender-based issues, and juvenile delinquency. The main goal for hiring a new tenure-track faculty was to strengthen the CDS program. For the past few years, we only have one faculty member teaching most of the CDS required core courses for the CDS program.
- Since advising is part of teaching in our department, hiring a new tenure track member will also help in reducing the advising load of the other tenure/track faculty, and hopefully improve our advising program.
- The faculty continued exploring/discussing the feasibility of creating a masters' program in social service.

Next Steps

1. Formally conducting a feasibility study to support/justify the creation of a masters' program in social service.
2. More effective dissemination of information among our majors about the importance of and opportunities for high impact learning opportunities such as internships, study abroad, and independent studies.
3. Connecting with alumni and donors via a newly created annual departmental newsletter (in progress).
4. Formalizing the senior exit interview process.
5. Improving the department's advising program by better matching students and advisors. The new faculty member and the Chair (both criminologists) will primarily advise CDS majors. Sociology majors will be primarily advised by faculty teaching sociology courses. This is in response to a concern among the faculty that they are having difficulties monitoring the academic progress of CDS majors due to the complexity of the CDS programs, and that some faculty are not familiar with the criminal justice field and careers in criminal justice.

AY 2015

Steps taken and/or to be taken to improve learning outcomes in our programs

- Establishing clear learning goals and objectives for the department and for our courses.
- Developing a culture of assessment with the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.
- Encouraging student learning engagement in and outside the classroom.
- Facilitation and encouraging collaborative research among faculty and students.
- Encourage students to engage in internships.
- Increase the number of tenure track faculty as a way of (2) diversifying course offerings, (2) make advising more effective, and (3) promote service within and outside the department.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIOLOGY 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIOLOGY 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIOLOGY 2014](#)
- [SOC General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [Department and Program Descriptions S-A-CDS 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIOLOGY 2017](#)
- [Overview of the Department 2018 Retreat Official Copy.pptx](#)
- [Retreat Program 2018.pdf](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Sociology, Anthropology, and CDS - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SOCIOLOGY 2018](#)

Program Name : Crime and Delinquency Studies BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

1. A preliminary and general assessment of our programs reveals the following:

(Note: Our majors are required to have a C or better in all courses which are part of the required 45 hours in SOC or CDS).

- For the Fall 2016, 78.7% of the majors (N=301) enrolled in our required core courses passed the courses with a grade of C or better.

The courses included are: AN210, AN315, SO101, SO125,SO261,SO320,SO353,SO418,SO450, and SO580.

- For the Spring 2017, 89% of the majors (N=254) enrolled in our required core courses passed the courses with a grade of C or better.

The courses included are: AN210, SO101, SO202, SO303, SO310, SO403, SO510, SO550, and SO565.

2. This year I decided to use the final project in my Sociology of Corrections class (a required course for all CDS majors) for assessment purposes (see included documentation). The project's main objective was to investigate the statistical correlation between the social-demographic characteristics of 50 states (race, social class, inequality, access to mental health services, etc) and the state's correctional population. The students were required to use information from the textbook to explain and interpret their correlation findings.

The project was used to measure the following CDS program objectives:

#2. Understand the key concepts and theories in criminology and criminal justice.

#8. Effectively express and communicate criminological and criminal justice knowledge inside and outside the classroom.

#10. Gain knowledge about how social factors such as race, gender, sexuality, social class, and age influence interactions and perceptions related to crime and criminal justice at the local, national, and global levels.

As the included documentation shows, using the scale below the average for the group was

2.68. It is evident that on average the students scored relatively low in the areas of interpretation and presentation/communication of the data and the results of their studies.

Project Assessment Scale

0No Evidence; No Interpretation Included

1Weak Evidence; Weak Interpretation

2Partial Evidence; Weak Interpretation

3Substantial Evidence; Limited Interpretation

4Strong Evidence, Insightful Interpretation

I will share this assessment tool with my colleagues to seek feedback and to develop similar rubrics for the assessment of the other required core courses in CDS and Sociology.

3. A survey will be sent out to the 2016-2017 graduate class to measure their level of satisfaction with the programs, their job placement experience, and recommendations for improving the programs.

4. I will meet with the Capstone instructor to make assessment of the capstone course and to explore areas in need of improvement.

AY 2016

The mapping of the curriculum for the Sociology and the CDS programs was a challenging yet rewarding experience. The task was accomplished by (1) analyzing all syllabi for the courses offered or to be offered to identify student learning outcomes and (2) matching them with the faculty approved list of program goals and objectives. This process was accompanied by individual and informal conversations with the faculty regarding what they teach in their courses and how what they teach fit into the department learning goals and objectives. The faculty reflection statement provided information on faculty initiatives for the future. The project turned out to be very educational and informative.

AY 2015

Program Assessments will include:

- Capstone project course (effective fall 2016)
- Course projects, written work, test scores, student paper presentations, poster sections, internship journals, etc.
- Senior exit interview
- Senior focus group

- Enrollment and retention data
- Job placement data
- Alumni survey
- Employer opinion survey

Attached Files

- [Sociology of Corrections Project Assessment](#)
- [SOCIOLOGY and CDS MAPPING SHEET 2015 HLC Revised May2016](#)
- [Soc-Senior-Survey-UG-FA2016-SP2017-SU2017-Grads](#)
- [LAS-SO-CRIME AND DELINQUENCY STUDIES-BS](#)

Program Name: Sociology and Anthropology BS/BA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2017

1. A preliminary assessment of our programs reveals the following:

- For the Fall 2016, 78.7 of the majors (N=301) enrolled in our required core courses passed the courses with a grade of C or better. The courses included are: AN210, AN315, SO101, SO125, SO261, SO320, SO353, SO418, SO450, and SO580.
- For the Spring 2017, 89% of the majors (N=254) enrolled in our required core courses passed the courses with a grade of C or better. The courses included are: AN210, SO101, So202, SO303, SO310, SO403, SO510, SO550, and SO565.

2. A survey will be sent out to the 2016-2017 graduate class to measure their level of satisfaction with the programs, their job placement experience, and recommendations for improving the programs.

3. I will meet with the Capstone instructor to make assessment of the capstone course and to explore areas in need of improvement.

AY2016

- During the academic year, the two faculty members in charge of designing the Capstone course (to be offered in the Fall 2016) discussed the logistics for its implementation. After monitoring student enrollment in the course it was agreed and determined that having two faculty teaching and coordinating the capstone course was not in the best interest of the students, the faculty, and the department. It was decided to have only one faculty in charge of the course, and the other faculty was reassigned to teach an online course.
- During the academic year, approximately 32 students enrolled in internship/practicum credit hours, and they produced about 4,300 hours of professional service to the community. The average GPA was 3.93 (4 Point Scale), and all students completed the course successfully.
- Four graduates will be attending graduate school starting the Fall 2016.
- As noted in the previous section, AKD Honor students and the Sociology Club had a very productive year.
- The use of the reflection statement form as a form of faculty self-assessment produced very interesting and informative data. Particularly important is the fact that our faculty are proactive in making the learning process in the classroom more productive and interactive by moving away from the exclusive use of the traditional lecture format and adopting class discussion techniques.
- We continue our efforts at implementing a new senior exit interview method. Our goal is to have a preliminary and experimental senior exit interview plan by the Spring 2017. As a preliminary step, I took the initiative of creating a short questionnaire to measure the extend to which, in the view of the students who were enrolled in SO510 (Theories of Crime and JD) the CDS program has met its learning. Overall, the data show that most students "strongly agree and agree" that because of their participation in the CDS program they have a better and more critical understanding of the criminal justice system (see uploaded file). However, it appears that, in the view of many students, we need to improve the way we communicate to our students the availability of internship opportunities, independent studies, and study abroad programs as a way of enhancing and applying what they have learned in the classroom to real life situations.
- The survey discussed above also indicated that most students were "very satisfied and somewhat satisfied" with the quality of advising in the department.

AY2015

- Capstone Project Course (To be implemented starting Fall 2016)
- Internship/Practicum: The data collected shows the following (2014-2015)
 1. 14 Students Enrolled in Internship/Practicum Courses
 2. The Average GPA For Those Enrolled Was 3.07 (4 Point Scale)
 3. 3 out of the 14 Students Enrolled Were Unsuccessful and Received a Grade of F

4. Excluding the 3 Students Who Did Not Complete the Internship/Practicum Successfully, the Average GPA was 3.91 (4 Point Scale)
- Four members of the Department's Sociology Honor Society (AKD) Presented Research Papers at the 2015 Papers Southwestern Social Science Association Meeting in Denver, Colorado
- Four Students Were Accepted at Different Graduate Programs Including University of Kansas, Wichita State University, Washburn University, and Emporia State University
- Senior Exit Interview Data Show The Following As Main Strengths of The Departments:

1. "Well rounded approach to CDS with many choices in classes."
2. "Overall, great professors who encourage students. I enjoyed the emphasis placed on internships."
3. "The teachers want you to learn."
4. "They are all very knowledgeable and have good advice on what employers and jobs find important and are very good at personally knowing each student and helping them find their needs."
5. "The teachers work well with each other which helps when it comes to learning what we need to learn."
6. "Great classes and glad the professors teach instead of GTA's."
7. "The professor's passion for the subject material."

Senior Exit Interview Data Show The Following Main Weaknesses of The Department:

1. "Somewhat assumes students knows what to aspect of C.J. system the student wants to get involved with, some more career exploration might be nice."
2. "Approach to the same course from professor to professor is sometimes inconsistent, causing confusion during enrollment."
3. "Not all the teachers have classes ironed out so complications occur. Can easily be fixed."
4. "The only thing I would say is their availability is difficult to meet my schedule , and also helping students make sure they are on track to graduate so there isn't any surprises at the end of the year."
5. "Some of the classes seem very similar. Some of the course work seems repeated at times."
6. "Not enough online/evening options."
7. "A few professors have reputations that keeps students from taking their classes."
8. "Changes in the curriculum and faculty has been stressful on the department as a whole."

Attached Files

[2016 Pilot Survey CDS Juniors&Seniors](#)

[LAS-SO-SOCIOLOGY-BS](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The changes that were both planned and implemented evidence the culture of assessment for the department. You have made changes to the curriculum by adding courses and implementing student learning improvement strategies. The topics for the spring faculty retreat and the progress made in drafting a department vision statement and the revision of the mission statement were excellent. You strategically used department specific institutional data and student success metrics to inform future direction for the department. Some of the outstanding outcomes for your assessment practices include the creation of the Correctional Services concentration in the CDS major program. The collaboration between the CDS and the Forensic Sciences program in establishing two new graduate courses Forensic Anthropology and Drugs: Society and the Body, will serve both programs well and provide students studying in each the opportunity to learn concurrently through the Anthropology and Forensic Science lenses. The strategy of bringing in the professional community to assist in identifying those characteristics that graduates need to have to best prepare them to make immediate contributions to the field is a best practice and is encouraged to remain part of your annual assessment practices.

The faculty assessment practices and reporting in the course level student learning outcomes reporting tool were appropriate for the first year of implementing this process beyond that of the general education courses. I believe that as faculty become more familiar with this process, the overall productivity of the assessment practices will improve student success in your programs. The process of assessing student learning and the faculty reflection that is a part of this process is an effective tool for improving student learning and building a student learning experience that is more engaged. You introduce strategies for enhancing the student experiences in the independent study, practicum, and internship experiences by increasing the accountability and integration of meetings with faculty mentors and supervisors. Yes, this is time consuming and requires faculty resources, but the end result is a better prepared graduate. These applied learning experiences often lead to employment opportunities for graduates. Sometimes it can be beneficial to develop more rigor into the structure of the documentation that is required for the field supervisor and the student to complete. At least be more intentional in planning what is exactly to be accomplished as a result of the applied learning experience. This work can be done on the front end and designed by the faculty supervising the course, the rigor and thought going into completing the documentation by the student and field supervisor is what enhances the expectations of the experience. If you choose to have a faculty retreat in the 2019 academic year, perhaps you may want to entertain a one-hour assessment of student learning workshop as a part of the faculty's professional development experience. Some of the faculty would benefit from enhancing their knowledge about how to assess their course student learning outcomes.

Overall, the department continues to make good strides in their assessment practices and it is apparent in the strategic directions of the department as a whole and for the programs and concentrations. You have done a great job in getting your faculty engaged in assessment practices and reporting for their courses. You are implementing your 5-Year Program Level Assessment Plans and you are using your assessment results to improve your programs and the student learning experiences. Very Nice Job and Keep up the Great Work!

Academic Year 2017

Overall, the department has made some important changes within the curriculum based on its assessment practices. The faculty have provided more flexibility in course selection for students fulfilling the requirements for elective courses external to the department which will help in improving time to degree completion. In addition, the newly implemented capstone course (SO580) is perfectly aligned with the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle that is being implemented this upcoming 2018 academic year. Student engagement in the learning experience aligned with an emphasis on high impact learning has been a productive strategy for improving student success in their programs, respectively. The success of your students in their major core courses across both of your degree programs is commendable (463/555; 83%). The Faculty have been engaged in professional development by attending workshops dedicated to learning assessment practices and techniques. The increased faculty participation in assessment of the general education courses is appreciated as we implement a comprehensive general education program assessment plan with intentional directed efforts in course embedded assessment practices. These assessment practices improve the student learning experience at the course level where faculty have the ability to directly impact student learning in general education courses. Your department serves a key role in providing general education foundational learning experiences. Continued faculty participation in the assessment of their courses as planned will provide the data that the chair will use to engage faculty in conversations about how to maintain the quality of the programs, navigate changes to the curriculum, and to look at ways to grow enrollment and as noted the potential to create a master of science degree. This is particularly appealing based on the new program incentive plan implemented by the President for this upcoming year. The attention the department has given to engaging students in high impact practices and the award recognitions are directly tied to the quality of the faculty, the programs, and the intentionality of engaging students with faculty in research projects at the undergraduate level and in participation in faculty-led study abroad learning experiences. It is important to acknowledge the assessment work put into updating the curriculum, mapping program learning objectives to course level student learning outcomes, and engaging the faculty in this work has played a major part in influencing the cultural changes that have occurred in the department over the past three years. Implementing the 5-Year assessment cycles for the department's programs will enable the improvement in the student learning experience to evolve to a greater extent. Continue to stay focused on faculty engagement in your department's assessment planning and implementation practices.

Academic Year 2016

Over the past two academic years, the progress that the department has made on integrating assessment into their processes is outstanding. This is a result of the quality of the leadership now in place. The Chair has led faculty in the updating of the curriculum for both the Criminal Justice and Crime and Delinquency Studies programs, and actually began this process a year earlier than other departments. There has been a more comprehensive assessment plan implemented over the past two years, including course embedded assessments, faculty perspectives, and external employer reviews. This is well rounded assessment work. The accomplishments of the students and faculty speak to the quality of the programs. Going forward it would be encouraging for you to share (uploaded files) the results and faculty change strategies for improving student learning at the course levels. You should have data to report from the assessments implemented this upcoming fall 2016 term. Keep up the excellent work of engaging faculty in the assessments and resulting student learning improvement strategies. The results of this work should begin appearing in improved retention and student success rates for the department. Job well

done!

Academic Year 2015

The Sociology, Anthropology, and Crime and Crime and Delinquency Studies has some short term and long term assessment opportunities going forward. With the addition of student learning outcomes included in all course syllabi and completion of the curriculum mapping exercise for each of the programs in the department will insure the currency of the programs and the alignment between the course student learning outcomes and the program learning outcomes. A well formulated curriculum map identifies and defines specifically those knowledge content, skills, values, and practical experiences (program learning outcomes) a graduate should possess at the completion of the degree program. And, the related contributions of each course in the program curriculum can be measured and directly tied to students achieving both course and program level learning goals. The maps show what you want students to learn and the courses provide the road map to get there.

Using course grades and student perspectives of their educational experiences can provide important information about the effectiveness of a program, but assessment should occur within course learning objectives at the assignment, test, project, etc. levels. It is shown in your report that this identification of what will be measured is a "work in progress." It will be a good next step to identify these metrics to measure student learning once the course learning outcomes have been determined. One will blend nicely with the other. For those courses that are common across two or more programs (i.e., Research Methods, Research Methods and Statistics), you can use the same common assessments as students will be taking the same course regardless of program specification. Overall, you have done some really good things this year and your next steps are good. It will be interesting to see what your faculty learn from the curriculum mapping exercises and the distribution of learning outcomes across the courses. It will be a good exercise for all as you adapt your department to the new *The Adaptive University* strategic plan.

Providing Department: Sociology, Anthropology, and Crime and Delinquency Studies

Responsible Roles: Alfredo Montalvo (E10088463)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT PLANS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Crime & Delinquency Studies BS/BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The capstone course is SO580 (Senior Capstone), SO472 (Sociology Practicum), and SO473 (Internship in CDS) are the courses that will be used to assess the student learning experience on an annual basis. Assignments, projects, and evaluations from intern supervisors will be used to evaluate the competencies of the students.

SO580 Capstone

Student Learning Outcomes:

- Understand how the self develops sociologically and to explain the relationship between the individual and society.
- Demonstrate critical thinking skills, including analysis and synthesis of key sociological
- concepts and theories by providing an original analysis of a social problem or issue.
- Raise a sociologically relevant question and outline a process and method by which the question might be researched and answered.
- Understand the key concepts and theories in social service, criminology and criminal justice.

The Capstone course is a semester course in which students pursue independent research or engage in a community project of their interest and choice with the guidance of the instructor. The student will produce a paper or a presentation that reflects a deep understanding of the topic. Overall, out of the 25 students enrolled in the course, 92% earned a letter grade of B or higher, 4% earned a letter grade of C, and 4% earned a letter of grade of D or lower. IDEA evaluation results indicate that the majority of the students rated the experience above the 4 point benchmark (4 points on a 5-point scale):

- Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories) 4.3
- Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures 4.3
- Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions) 4.3
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course 4.3
- Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing 4.3
- Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth 4.3
- Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making 4.3
- Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view 4.3

- Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good 4.3
- Learning appropriate methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting numerical information 4.3

SO472 Sociology Practicum and SO473 Internship In Crime and Delinquency Studies

Student Learning Outcomes:

- Demonstrate critical thinking skills, including analysis and synthesis of key sociological concepts and theories by providing an original analysis of a social problem or issue.
- Learn about the practical relevance and importance of sociological knowledge for understanding public opinion polls, governmental policies, and mass media reports by using different methodological techniques available in sociology.
- Effectively express and communicate sociological knowledge inside and outside the classroom.
- Understand the key concepts and theories in social service and criminal justice.
- Understand the philosophies, theories, and policies guiding the social services systems.

Twelve students enrolled in the internship course during the academic year, and only one student did not complete the work (F). The interns did their work at the local law enforcement agencies and the local jail. Ten students enrolled in the sociology practicum and they worked for different family and children service agencies. These students also earned a letter grade of B or higher. Based on the feedback received by the participants, it is evident the need to make these courses more meaningful by meeting with the student more frequently during the semester as a way of monitoring their progress and increasing their engagement and critical reflection.

Recommendation for improvement: pay a stipend to a faculty member to supervise interns and practitioners.

Attached Files

- [LAS-CDS-CURRICULUM MAP 2016](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-AN210-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-SO402-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-SO370-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO101-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO310-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO353-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Rowley-Rochelle-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Obermeyer-Brice-AN210-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Rowley-Rochelle-SO261-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Rowley-Rochelle-SO261-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Todd-Jan-SO261-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO403-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO354-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO418-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO450-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

SO310 Law Enforcement

Student Learning Outcomes:

- Understand the subject matter and methods of study in the area.
- Understand how the law enforcement system operates.
- Be informed about the critical issues in law enforcement.
- Be informed about the role of law enforcement within the criminal justice system.
- Think critically about the criminal justice system

The instructor used regular exams, expert guest speakers, and audio-visual material to enhance the student learning outcomes. IDEA results (as reported by the students) for this course indicate that the use of these teaching strategies: (4 points or higher on a 5-point scale). (See Included PDF Summative File)

- Helped students to interpret subject matter from diverse perspectives.
- Encouraged students to reflect on and evaluate what they have learned
- Stimulated students to intellectual effort beyond that required by most courses
- Helped students relate course material to real life situations
- Created opportunities for students to apply course content outside the classroom
- Encouraged students to work in teams or groups to facilitate learning
- Allowed students to share ideas and experiences with others whose backgrounds and viewpoints differ from their own

Out of the 33 students enrolled in the course, 85% earned a letter grade of B or higher and only 15% earned a letter grade of D or lower.

SO403 Sociology of Corrections

Student Learning Outcomes

- Understand the history of punishment in America.
- Understand the philosophies behind correctional practice
- Have gained an understanding of the statistical patterns of the correctional population.
- Understand the factors that influence the increase and decrease in the correctional Population

The instructor used regular exams, field trips, 2 short papers, a term paper, and audio-visual material to enhance the student learning outcomes. IDEA results (as reported by the students) for this course indicate that the use of these teaching strategies helped students in:(4 points or higher on a 5-point scale). (See Summative PDF File)

- Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories)
- Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures
- Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
- Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity
- Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth
- Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good
- Learning appropriate methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting numerical
- Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing (3.9)
- Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team (3.8)

As the last 2 items listed above indicate, there appears to be a need for more class discussion and group work. The field trips to the prison in Topeka and the Lyon County Jail helped in expanding the students' learning experience based on the feedback I received from the students who attended. Overall, out of the 29 students enrolled in the course, 55% earned a letter grade of B or higher, 21% earned a letter grade of C, and 21% earned a letter of grade of D or lower. The students who did not earn a letter grade of C or better did not attend class regularly, did not do the required projects, and /or did not take the final exam.

SO 125 Introduction to Criminal Justice

Student Learning Outcomes:

- Upon completion of this course the students should be able to:
- Understand the subject matter and methods of study in the area.
- Understand how the criminal justice system operates.
- Be informed about several areas in criminal justice system.
- Think critically about the criminal justice system.

The instructor used regular exams, expert guest speakers, and audio-visual material to enhance the student learning outcomes. IDEA results (as reported by the students) for this course indicate that the use of these teaching strategies: (4 points or higher on a 5-point scale). (See Included PDF Summative File)

- Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories) 4.3
- Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures 4
- Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions) 4.2
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course 4.1
- Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth 4
- Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making 4.2
- Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view 4.1
- Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good 4.5

The following areas appear to be in need of improvement:

- Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team 3.9
- Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing 3.5

Overall, out of the 34 students enrolled in the course, 94% earned a letter grade of B or higher,6% earned a letter grade of C, and 0% earned a letter of grade of D or lower.

SO353 Criminology

Student Learning Outcomes:

- Compare and contrast different perspectives on crime.
- Understand the political and economic impact of crime in society.
- Understand some macro and micro factors explaining crime.
- Apply criminological theories to explain geographical and seasonal patterns of crime.

This is a high-level theoretical course and it is required for all CDS majors. The course was based on a combination of lectures, class discussion, guest speakers and the use of audio-visual material. Overall, out of the 25 students enrolled in the course, 52 % earned a letter grade of B or higher, 32% earned a letter grade of C, and 16% earned a letter of grade of D or lower. The students who did not earn a letter grade of C or better did not attend class regularly, did not do the required project, and /or did not take the final exam.

IDEA evaluation results indicate that there is a need to improve in the following areas (below 4 points on a 5-point scale):

- Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories) 3.8
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course 3.9
- Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth 3.8
- Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making 3.6
- Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view 3.9
- Learning appropriate methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting numerical information 3.5

These results will be shared with the new faculty who will be teaching the course during the Fall of 2018.

SO471 Independent Study

Student Learning Outcomes:

- Understand how the self develops sociologically and to explain the relationship between the individual and society.
- Demonstrate critical thinking skills, including analysis and synthesis of key sociological concepts and theories by providing an original analysis of a social problem or issue.
- Raise a sociologically relevant question and outline a process and method by which the question might be researched and answered.

During the academic year, thirteen students enrolled in SO471 of which only one failed the course. The others earned a letter grade of B or higher. Four students engaged in practical field experiences involving organizing and evaluating tours for our majors and guest speaker presentations. The students investigated questions related to following topics: wrongful convictions, life under community probation supervision, life behind bar, and Yoga as a behavioral management tool. Based on the feedback received by the participants it is evident the need to make the independent study more meaningful by meeting with the student more frequently during the semester as a way of monitoring their progress and increasing their engagement and critical reflection. Recommendation for improvement: pay a stipend to a faculty member to supervise interns and practitioners.

Attached Files

- [SO310-IDEA-Evaluation.pdf](#)
- [SO403 IDEA Summative 2018.pdf](#)
- [SO353 Criminology Evaluation 2018.pdf](#)
- [SO580 Capstone 2018.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

SO418

SO450

SO510

SO340

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

SO410

SO408

SO315

SO330

SO370

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:**Providing Department:** Crime & Delinquency Studies BS/BA**Responsible Roles:** Alfredo Montalvo (E10088463)**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1****Sociology and Anthropology BS/BA****Start:** 07/01/2016**End:** 06/30/2022**Progress:** Ongoing over Multiple Years**Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:**

- The capstone course is SO580 (Senior Capstone), SO472 (Sociology Practicum), and SO473 (Internship in CDS) are the courses that will be used to assess the student learning experience on an annual basis. Assignments, projects, and evaluations from intern supervisors will be used to evaluate the competencies of the students.

SO580 Capstone**Student Learning Outcomes:**

- Understand how the self develops sociologically and to explain the relationship between the individual and society.
- Demonstrate critical thinking skills, including analysis and synthesis of key sociological concepts and theories by providing an original analysis of a social problem or issue.
- Raise a sociologically relevant question and outline a process and method by which the question might be researched and answered.
- Understand the key concepts and theories in social service, criminology and criminal justice.

The Capstone course is a semester course in which students pursue independent research or engage in a community project of their interest and choice with the guidance of the instructor. The student will produce a paper or a presentation that reflects a deep understanding of the topic. Overall, out of the 25 students enrolled in the course, 92% earned a letter grade of B or higher, 4% earned a letter grade of C, and 4% earned a letter of grade of D or lower. IDEA evaluation results indicate that the majority of the students rated the experience above the 4 point benchmark (4 points on a 5-point scale):

- Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories) 4.3
- Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures 4.3
- Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions) 4.3
- Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course 4.3
- Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing 4.3
- Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth 4.3
- Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making 4.3
- Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view 4.3
- Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good 4.3
- Learning appropriate methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting numerical information 4.3

SO471 Independent Study**Student Learning Outcomes:**

- Understand how the self develops sociologically and to explain the relationship between the individual and society.
- Demonstrate critical thinking skills, including analysis and synthesis of key sociological concepts and theories by providing an original analysis of a social problem or issue.
- Raise a sociologically relevant question and outline a process and method by which the question might be researched and answered.

During the academic year, thirteen students enrolled in SO471 of which only one failed the course. The others earned a letter grade of B or higher. Four students engaged in practical field experiences involving organizing and evaluating tours for our majors and guest speaker presentations. The students investigated questions related to following topics: wrongful convictions, life under community probation supervision, life behind bar, and Yoga as a behavioral management tool. Based on the feedback received by the participants it is evident the need to make the independent study more meaningful by meeting with the student more frequently during the semester as a way of monitoring their progress and increasing their engagement and critical reflection. Recommendation for improvement: pay a stipend to a faculty member to supervise interns and practitioners.

SO472 Sociology Practicum and SO473 Internship In Crime and Delinquency Studies

Student Learning Outcomes:

- Demonstrate critical thinking skills, including analysis and synthesis of key sociological concepts and theories by providing an original analysis of a social problem or issue.
- Learn about the practical relevance and importance of sociological knowledge for understanding public opinion polls, governmental policies, and mass media reports by using different methodological techniques available in sociology.
- Effectively express and communicate sociological knowledge inside and outside the classroom.
- Understand the key concepts and theories in social service and criminal justice.
- Understand the philosophies, theories, and policies guiding the social services systems.

Twelve students enrolled in the internship course during the academic year, and only one student did not complete the work (F). The interns did their work at the local law enforcement agencies and the local jail. Ten students enrolled in the sociology practicum and they worked for different family and children service agencies. These students also earned a letter grade of B or higher. Based on the feedback received by the participants, it is evident the need to make these courses more meaningful by meeting with the student more frequently during the semester as a way of monitoring their progress and increasing their engagement and critical reflection.

Recommendation: There is a need for hiring or paying overload to a faculty member to supervise and evaluate interns and practitioners. Future part-time budget allocation should include this item as a main instructional priority.

Attached Files

- [LAS-SOC-CURRICULUM MAP 2016](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-AN210-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-SO402-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Camara-Evandro-SO370-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO101-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO310-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO403-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Obermeyer-Brice-AN210-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Montalvo-Alfredo-SO353-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Rowley-Rochelle-SO261-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Rowley-Rochelle-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Rowley-Rochelle-SO261-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Todd-Jan-SO261-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO101-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO354-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO418-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Westfall-David-SO450-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

SO101 Introduction to Sociology

Although we offer several sections of SO101 and they are taught by different instructors, these sections share the following SLOs in common.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

Consistent with the Departmental Goals and Objectives, upon completion of this courses, students should be able to:

- Understand how the self develops sociologically and to explain the relationship between the individual and society. (General Education Goal 4)
- Provide examples of how culture and social structure shape individual lives. (Goal 4)

- Demonstrate critical thinking skills, including analysis and synthesis of key sociological concepts and theories. (General Education Goal 5)
- Learn about the practical relevance and importance of sociological knowledge for understanding society. (General Education Goal 5)
- Identify practical ethical issues involved with the study of human behavior. (General Education Goal 6)
- Develop an understanding of the social forces that influence human conduct. (General Education Goal 4)

Based on the IDEA evaluation results, there appears to be a need for more class discussion and group work (3.9 on a 5-point scale). This finding is consistent across all SO101 sections. Overall, out of a sample of 45 students who declared Sociology or CDS as his/her major, 56% earned a letter grade of B or higher, 18% earned a letter grade of C, and 27% earned a letter grade of D or F.

Recommendation: Since a C or better is required for Sociology majors it would be important to monitor the academic progress of these students to determine their potential to stay in the program and to refer them to the most appropriate tutoring services.

Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories)	4.2
Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures	4.4
Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	4.3
Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course	4.2
Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team	4.2
Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)	4.3
Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing	3.9
Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth	4
Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making	4.3
Learning to <i>analyze</i> and <i>critically evaluate</i> ideas, arguments, and points of view	4.3
Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good	4.3

SO202 Social Problems

Student Learning Outcomes

- Develop and converse with advanced sociological vocabulary concerning the Social Problems in America.
- Lead two class interactions concerning a chosen topic
- Investigate two topics through micro/macro investigation. Choosing a micro-topic concerning a subject related to a social problem in American Society. Students will apply theory that connects the micro- topic to larger societal problems, socialized patterns and theory.
- Conduct an outside observation concerning a social problem that student will use for final project.
- Learn to integrate outside observation with a creative presentation.

Based on the IDEA evaluation results, there appears to be a need for more class discussion and group work (3.8, 3.7, 3.8 on a 5-point scale). This finding is consistent with other courses in the program. Overall, out of the 20 students enrolled in the course, 90% earned a letter grade of B or higher, 5% earned a letter grade of C, and 5% earned a letter grade of D or F.

Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories)	4.2
Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures	4.4
Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	4.2

Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course	4.2
Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team	3.8
Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing	3.7
Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth	3.8
Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making	4
Learning to <i>analyze</i> and <i>critically evaluate</i> ideas, arguments, and points of view	4.2
Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good	4.2

SO303 Social Deviance

Student Learning Outcomes

- To understand how deviance is defined and produced.
- To gain a working knowledge of the key sociological theories of deviance.
- To apply these ideas [sociological theories] critically to selected case studies.
- To critique and evaluate responses to deviance and social control.

Based on the IDEA evaluation results (see table below), the students rated this course at or above 4 points on a 5-point scale.

Overall, out of the 27 students enrolled in the course, 93% earned a letter grade of B or higher and 7% earned a letter grade of D or F. During informal conversation with the instructor of the course we agreed that the theoretical content of this course is covered in two required core courses: Criminology and Juvenile Delinquency. We will be revising the course or the core curriculum for the CDS program to reduce or eliminate redundancy as much as possible.

Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories)	4.2
Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures	4.4
Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	4.3
Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course	4.2
Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team	4.2
Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth	4
Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making	4.3
Learning to <i>analyze</i> and <i>critically evaluate</i> ideas, arguments, and points of view	4.3
Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good	4.3
Learning appropriate methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting numerical information	3.9

AN315 Family in Cross Cultural Perspective

- **Learning Outcome 1:** This course will provide a survey of the field of Kinship Studies in Anthropology including the origin and history of the field, basic and advanced terminology and major theoretical perspectives.
- **Learning Outcome 2:** This course will provide knowledge of, and appreciation for, the diversity of family systems through readings and videos from over a dozen world cultures that describe how different types of families function in other cultures.
- **Learning Outcome 3:** This course will provide instruction on how to accurately construct a kinship diagram that will accurately depict a family system.
- **Learning Outcome 4 -** This course will provide a basic understanding of a psycho-anthropological systems theory approach to understanding the economic and emotional dynamics of the human family system.

Based on the IDEA evaluation results (see table below), the students rated this course below 4 points on a 5-point scale in all learning categories. Based on my discussion of these results with the instructor, it appears that the students have difficulties relating to the subject, particularly the core anthropological concept of kinship. It is possible, that students who are very interested in anthropology or archeology appear to perform better than sociology majors who are interested in social service; a concern that we addressed by offering SO400 as a substitute for AN315. We discussed the possibility of eliminating AN315 as a required course for sociology majors, however, in my view it is too premature for the implementation of this change. Overall, out of the 23 students enrolled in the course, 26% earned a letter grade of B or higher, 43% earned a letter grade of C and 31% earned a letter grade of D or F. This relatively high number of students (7 out of 23) failing the course will be a topic of discussion and analysis with the goal of identifying the factors affecting the students' academic achievement.

Student Ratings of Learning on Relevant Objectives

Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories)	2.8
Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures	3.2
Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	3.2
Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course	2.6
Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team	2.8
Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing	2.6
Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth	2.8
Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making	2.4
Learning to <i>analyze</i> and <i>critically evaluate</i> ideas, arguments, and points of view	2.6
Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good	2.6
Learning appropriate methods for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting numerical information	2.4

SO400 The Family in Social Context

Student Learning Outcomes

- Develop and converse with advanced sociological vocabulary concerning the institution of the Family.
- Lead a class discussion concerning a chosen topic.
- Investigate two topics through micro/macro investigation. Choosing a micro-topic concerning a subject related to the institution of the Family. Students will apply theory that connects the micro-topic to larger societal problems, socialized patterns and theory.
- Conduct an outside observation concerning the Institutional Family. Learn to integrate outside observation with presentation of final project.

Based on the IDEA evaluation results (see table below), the students rated this course at or above 4 points on a 5-point scale. Overall, out of the 18 students enrolled in the course, 89% earned a letter grade of B or higher, only 1 student earned a letter grade of F, and 1 student received an incomplete.

Gaining a basic understanding of the subject (e.g., factual knowledge, methods, principles, generalizations, theories)	4.3
Developing knowledge and understanding of diverse perspectives, global awareness, or other cultures	4.4
Learning to <i>apply</i> course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)	4.4
Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course	4.5
Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team	4.3
Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing	4.3
Learning how to find, evaluate, and use resources to explore a topic in depth	4.1
Developing ethical reasoning and/or ethical decision making	4.1
Learning to <i>analyze</i> and <i>critically evaluate</i> ideas, arguments, and points of view	4.3
Learning to apply knowledge and skills to benefit others or serve the public good	4.4

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

SO550

SO565

SO345

SO370

SO401

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

SO351

SO354

SO408

SO420

SO320

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Sociology and Anthropology BS/BA

Responsible Roles: Alfredo Montalvo (E10088463)

UNIT REPORT**General Education Program Assessment Report 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:22 AM

**General Education Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:**

The General Education program is aligned with six student learning goals with defined learning objectives affiliated with each. The assessment program is based on measuring student learning outcomes and student satisfaction related to these six goals. The program's minimum hourly requirement is set at 48 credit hours with distribution across the academic disciplines including the Creative Arts, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Multicultural Awareness.

1) The comprehensive assessment plan for the General Education program uses both direct and indirect assessments of student learning.

Direct Assessment - Overview

The direct assessments include course-embedded assessments, student portfolio's, and assignments scored using internally and externally designed instruments (AAC&U value rubrics). Through the fall of 2017, the external direct instrument used for measuring competencies for writing skills, writing essay, mathematics, and reading was the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP). The ACT-CAAP linkage studies were added to the assessment mix in 2013, but were discontinued when the information from the value added metrics were not considered as a reliable means for determining whether or not students were really making the expected improvements in knowledge and skills. In December of 2017, the ACT announced that the CAAP was being discontinued. The external direct assessment is now the Educational Testing Services - Praxis-CORE (Reading, Writing, and Math). The spring 2018 term is the initial data gathering opportunity and reporting will begin in academic year 2019. Faculty continue to use course-embedded student learning outcomes assessments to inform change strategies in their general education courses.

Assessing General Education Program Goals - Coordination and Implementation

In the fall of 2016, a General Education Assessment Team was identified as the entity responsible for coordinating cyclical assessment and review of the general education program at the goal level. Annually, the GEAT is appointed by the Director of General Education to provide focused assessment efforts in key areas. The GEAT consists of faculty from across the disciplines who engage in specific assessment projects annually to review, evaluate, and report findings related to general education program goals being met, and that a continuous cycle of improved student learning exists. Team charge and organizational documents are presented in the evidence files. The coordination of the GEAT is a collaborative effort between the Director of General Education and the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness. The GEAT provides an annual report of the assessment work completed along with recommendations for improvement of the general education program that is shared with the Council on General Education and key academic areas that are critical to implementing recommendations and change strategies. The inaugural GEAT (Academic Year 2017) focused its assessment efforts on assessing General Education Goal 1: Core Skills - Written and Oral Communication, Mathematical Reasoning, and Information Technology and Information Literacy. The GEAT (Academic Year 2018) focused its assessment efforts on General Education Program Goal 2 - Demonstrate knowledge of concepts and principles in a wide range of academic disciplines: A - the Creative Arts, B - Humanities, C - the Life Sciences, D - The Physical Sciences, E - Social and Behavioral Sciences, F and Goal 3 - Demonstrate knowledge of similarities and differences among the world's cultures, past and present.

2) Targeted course-embedded assessments for written communication, oral communication, analytical reasoning, and critical thinking skills include rubric scoring of student assignments in those courses identified specifically to address these core skills. For written communication, the portfolio analysis of student works from both composition I and composition II courses evidence the transitions occurring in writing skills from the first to the second levels of the composition courses (ongoing since 2014). This information informs curricular changes as well as improving the training for graduate teaching assistants who teach composition courses. Oral Communication has been assessed in SP101 Public Speaking since 2015 using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Oral Communication. Analytical Reasoning has been assessed for the MA110 College Algebra Courses using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Analytical Reasoning since 2015, as well.

3) The critical thinking (Goal 5) rubric evaluation began in the spring 2015 term creating an analysis of the impact of critical thinking skills across four separate disciplines. Student assignments were collected from History, Biology, Business, and Psychology general education courses from both the fall and spring terms, while faculty from each of the representative disciplines scored the student works and reported

the findings. For the History, Business, and Psychology courses, the assessments were concluded in spring of 2017. This cycle of assessment is continuing for Psychology 100 into spring 2019, to provide three-year comparative data. The plan is to study the 3-year trend data to provide information to the General Education Council to inform any directed change strategies.

Since the spring of 2014, Faculty have continuously used course embedded assessments aligned with tests, research, papers, and surveys to measure those general education goals that are a part of their course curriculum. These individual assessments allow for faculty to make adjustments to their pedagogy, deliveries, and curriculum content at the course level as the data informs. Faculty report their course assessment information using the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting tool that is hosted in the Baseline module of the Campus Labs assessment data management platform.

Indirect Assessment - Overview

The indirect assessments used for general education program assessment include the Senior Survey (internal) and the National Survey of Student Engagement and Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (external). The information provided in these surveys are linked in files in the file repository.

3) All of these assessment data points align with both *The Adaptive University* strategic plan Goal #3: Enhancing the competitive role of Kansas by achieving the State's goals for public higher education and Kansas Board of Regents *Foresight 2020* strategic plan Goal #2, performance of students on institutional assessments for core workplace skills.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Level Key Strategies and Adaptations and Next Steps:

Academic Year 2017-2018

1) Course Embedded Direct Assessment remains a priority for faculty participation in direct assessment of student learning. Reporting course embedded assessment results and the accompanying student learning improvement strategies occurs on an annual basis. Efforts to increase faculty participation in this essential process have been very successful especially during the 2017-2018 academic year. The number of faculty completing assessment reports based on embedded direct assessment increase from 93 to 153 during the past academic year, and during the past five years it has increased from 25 to 153. The cumulative effects on improving student learning is evident in the variety of improvement strategies faculty are using based on their course assessment data.

2) GEAT II (2018) The second version of the General Education Assessment Team was responsible for reviewing syllabi and other materials regarding General Education Goals 2 and 3. They also completed a faculty survey regarding courses being taught that satisfy General Education Goals 2 and 3. One of their recommendations regarded review of general education courses to determine if in their current form they are in the correct category. The GEAT II annual report is available in the file library.

3) NSSE - FSSE - The National Survey of Student Engagement and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement were administered in the spring of 2018. In alignment with the cultural competencies GE goal being assessed by the GEAT II, the NSSE Topical module - Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity was selected. As was, the Experiences with Information Literacy topical module aligning with the "Information Literacy" goal assessment from the GEAT I. The use of the survey data received from these administrations will be forthcoming in the 2019 academic year as the data are analyzed and gleaned for utility in making decisions to improve the program. The information will also be shared with academic departments who instruct those general education courses aligned with the topics of the surveys.

4) Senior Survey - The results from the senior survey again have provided some meaningful student perspectives and some comments referring to potential directions to change the program. Some of the topics identified in this year's survey (reduce the program and create more variety and options) are currently on the agenda for the General Education Council and are positioned to inform change in the 2019 academic year. The outcomes of the work of the General Education Council will be documented in the meeting minutes and are shared transparently on the OIE website.

5) Transition from the CAAP to the ETS-Praxis-CORE

During the last month of the 2017 academic year, the institution was notified by ACT, Inc. that the CAAP test series was being retired as of December 31, 2017. It was determined that the data from the summer 2017 and fall 2017 CAAP administrations would be the last iteration of this assessment data being collected, analyzed and reported as an external direct assessment. The institution will transition to using the ETS-Praxis CORE as the entrance requirement for teacher education majors. The institution will begin tracking, analyzing, and reporting these CORE test scores in the aggregate as the external direct assessment instrument for reading, writing, and mathematical skills.

Academic Year 2016-2017

1) Course embedded direct assessment continues to be a priority with faculty participation in reporting course embedded assessment results and accompanying student learning improvement strategies growing on an annual basis (see attached file). Over the course of four years, faculty participation in reporting course embedded assessments has increased by 272% from 25 to 93 completed assessment reports (see Faculty Participation in Course Embedded Assessment file). The impact on improving student learning is evident in the accumulated results of these faculty efforts. This also evidences four years of closing the loop on course embedded student learning outcomes assessment and the resulting student learning improvement strategies (General Education Course Embedded Assessment Results).

2) The General Education Assessment Team (GEAT) responded to a legitimate void in the assessment process which was assessing the across discipline contributions to student learning of general education goals at the goal level. In gaining an understanding of how faculty from multiple disciplines were contributing to students learning of core skills and how this learning was being measured and actualized in multiple courses brought an important new perspective on how core skills were being taught and learned. The efforts and expertise of the 2017 GEAT resulted in a comprehensive analysis of General Education Goal 1: Core Skills and recommendations to improve the program (GEAT Annual Assessment Project Report). The GEAT results are shared with the General Education Council, the Student Learning Assessment Council, and on the Institutional Effectiveness website. The recommendations are shared with those entities that could use the information to inform change strategies and/or confirm the effectiveness of student learning.

3) The National Survey of Student Engagement was administered in the Spring of 2016 and is now given to Freshmen and Seniors on a every other year basis. It was determined that this strategy allows for a year in between administrations to analyze, prepare, and share the findings to provide operational units the necessary time to employ change strategies. The two topical modules selected for this administration was Learning of Foundational Skills and Diversity Initiatives. In addition to this module, the high impact practices section also aligns with the strategic planning initiatives of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion plan strategies. In addition to the NSSE, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) will be administered in the Spring of 2018 with the topical modules being Inclusiveness and Engagement in Cultural Diversity and Experiences with Information Literacy. These two topical modules align with change strategies from the GEAT I (2017) findings and recommendations and the GEAT II (2018) assessment of Goal 3: Demonstrate knowledge of similarities and differences among the world's cultures, past and present. The results from these surveys will provide important data regarding student engagement in these two key topical areas.

4) The Senior Survey has been administered and the results are made available to Deans, Chairs, Faculty, and Students. The annual results are available on the website as well. The response rate for the AY2017 administration was 44% (320/779) and the percentage of surveys completed was 77% (247/320). This survey has a group of questions that asks students about their growth in knowledge and skills directly related to the general education program goals. It also contains an open-ended question that asks students for feedback regarding their perceptions of the program in general. The results of the senior surveys (multiple years) are uploaded in the file library. The last time the questions were updated was in 2012, and the Director of General Education is planning to ask for the assistance of the General Education Council and GEAT to provide input for new or revision of the existing questions, to be edited in the survey launched in AY 2018.

5) The externally normed standardized test used to measure students' competencies in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics is the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP).

Academic Year 2015-2016

1). Course embedded direct assessments show that progress is being made on impacting student learning at key contact points and that the general education goals and objectives are being measured as a part of the overall courses assessments. There were 36 faculty who shared their course embedded assessment plans and findings throughout the 2014-2015 academic time frame. These findings evidence approximately 50% of the general education courses were assessed and reported. The participation from faculty continues to gain momentum as 50 faculty members participated in the 2015-2016 academic year. The goal is for all general education courses to annually engage in assessment practices as a function of the overall assessment of the course whereas the general education goals are integrated into the overall evaluation. For the upcoming 2017 academic year, a policy for requiring all faculty to engage in the annual assessment for their courses is being proposed by the Provost to the Faculty Senate governance.

2). The National Survey of Student Engagement and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement provide data to ascertain whether Emporia State University is fulfilling its commitment in providing students the necessary foundational skills and transformative learning experiences expected in their general educations. These data serve to identify where ESU rates when benchmarked with other institutions. The NSSE and FSSE surveys are administered every three years. For the AY 2016 year, the NSSE was administered and results were obtained in August. Over the course of the 2017 AY, the results will be shared with units across the campus and used to inform student learning and to benchmark with plains peers and similar Carnegie classified institutions (Masters I).

3). The Senior Survey is administered twice a year for those students who are scheduled to graduate in either the fall or spring/summer

terms. This instrument has a bank of questions dedicated to the general education learning experience while providing both quantitative and qualitative feedback. The senior survey data specific to the bank of general education items has been filtered from the overall results and is attached as an evidence document. This data will be combined and triangulated with the other data assessing core skills from the General Education Assessment Team as they complete the cycle of assessment for GE Goal 1 in AY 2017.

4). The externally normed standardized test used to measure students competencies in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics is the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP). These tests are used to confirm student competencies and to benchmark with other peer and national institutions. CAAP and ACT linkage studies are also used to confirm students value added for the same skills and knowledge. The CAAP testing of all students as a graduation requirement was discontinued and the requirement made retroactive as of the spring 2016 term. This was the result of a Faculty Senate Bill rescinding the requirements. The bill is attached as an evidence document. However, students wishing to enter the Teacher Education program are required to take either the PRAXIS-CORE or the CAAP tests to meet competency requirements to be admitted into the program. This is a State of Kansas requirement. The data from the CAAP will still be used as an external direct measure source when assessing student learning in the reading, writing, and mathematics.

Attached Files

- [📄 GEAT Annual Assessment Project Report - Year 1](#)
- [📄 Course Embedded Specific Student Learning Assessments Annual Report 8-4-2017](#)
- [📄 Initial Breakout of Faculty Participation in Course Embedded Assessment Trends 8-4-2017](#)
- [📄 Assessment Report for Composition Program - 5-16-14 UAC1883](#)
- [📄 CAAP Multi-Year Analysis Trend and Stats Worksheet 4-2014 UAC1648](#)
- [📄 ESU General Education Goals and LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes Alignments](#)
- [📄 General Education Goals and Outcomes - Crosswalk to 2015 Catalog Numbers](#)
- [📄 Student Learning Assessment Report - KBOR - 5-23-2014](#)
- [📄 Course Embedded Specific Student Learning Core Skills - Goal 1 8-10-2015](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 3-17-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-2-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-9-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-30-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 10-14-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 10-28-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 11-4-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 12-2-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 1-20-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 2-3-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 2-10-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 3-17-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-2-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-9-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-30-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 10-14-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 10-28-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 11-4-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 12-2-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Organizational Meeting 8-16-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 1-20-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 2-3-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 2-10-2017](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 1-12-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 3-2-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 4-20-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 3-16-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 8-30-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-1-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-13-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 10-11-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 10-20-2017.pdf](#)

- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-15-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 11-3-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 12-6-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 1-12-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 3-16-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 3-2-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 4-20-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 8-30-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-1-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-13-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-15-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 10-20-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 12-6-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 10-11-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 11-3-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT II charge - HLC Document.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT II Annual Assessment Project Report AY2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 FINAL RESULTS - General-Education-Program-Goal-Evaluation-Survey 3-8-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 General Education Goals 2 and 3 - Catalog Listing.pdf](#)
- [📄 General-Education-Program-Goal-Evaluation-Survey-Prelim Results 3-2-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 Senior Survey GE Item Results Graph AY2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 ESU Presentation for Assessment Matters Conference 5-5-2017.pptx](#)

Program Name: Direct Assessments - Course Embedded/Rubrics Scoring

Summary of Program Assessments:

Academic Year 2017-2018

Course level student learning outcomes assessment continues with greater participation by faculty. Efforts continue to provide additional course-level assessment training for faculty. Plans have been made to include assessment training in new faculty orientation for General Education and other programs. A new document, "Survival Kit for Student Outcomes Assessment" was developed for new faculty orientation and a copy was given to each new faculty member attending the assessment training portion of new professor orientation in August of 2018.

Academic Year 2016-2017

In addition to faculty reporting of course level student learning outcomes assessment (Report uploaded in file library), there were faculty groups assessing critical thinking skills, written communication skills, mathematical and analytical skills, and oral communication skills.

These assessments utilized the AAC&U value rubrics as the instrument to rate the student assignments and portfolio's. The reports for these assessments are included in the evidence files in the file library.

Academic Year 2015-2016

The general education assessment reports (attached as evidence files) show that faculty are being informed from course embedded assessments and are making both curricular and pedagogical changes to improve student learning. In 2014, thirty-six faculty reported course embedded assessments with planned student learning improvement strategies. Additionally, twenty-seven faculty participated in 2015 assessments. There is progress being made on the overall expectation that all general education faculty will engage in course embedded assessment of general education goals as mapped in the courses they teach. This is one of the main opportunities to enhance the amount of assessment work being done. In 2016, 50 faculty submitted course embedded assessment reports. Over the past three years, there have been a series of workshops both on- and off- campus where faculty members were provided professional development opportunities to hone assessment skills and knowledge. Workshop support materials and publications are attached as evidence files.

Attached Files

- [📄 2015 KBOR Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning Report](#)
- [📄 Course Embedded Specific Student Learning Assessments Spring 2014](#)
- [📄 Course Embedded Specific Student Learning Assessments Spring 2015](#)
- [📄 Course Specific Student Learning Assessments 1-30-2015](#)
- [📄 Critical Thinking Assessments Report - General Education Program June 2015](#)
- [📄 Curriculum Map 1-30-2015](#)

- [General Education Critical Thinking Assessments 3-Year Report June 2015 - 2017](#)
- [ASSESSMENT Summary for AACU Oral Comm VALUE Rubric AY 2017](#)
- [Written Communication Assessment Report O'Meara 24.17](#)
- [Course Embedded Specific Student Learning Assessments Core Skills - Goal 1](#)
- [Course Embedded Specific Student Learning Core Skills - Goal 1 8-10-2015](#)
- [Assessment Report for Composition Program - 5-16-14.pdf](#)
- [September 2016 Math Assessment Report - 5-5-2016](#)
- [ASSESSMENT Summary for AACU Oral Comm VALUE Rubric AY 2016](#)
- [Curriculum Mapping by Director of General Education AY2016](#)
- [September 2017 Math Assessment Report - 5-11-2017](#)
- [Course Embedded Assessments Gen Ed Goal 1 - 2017](#)
- [Course Embedded Assessments Gen Ed Goal 2 - 2017](#)
- [Course Embedded Assessments Gen Ed Goal 3 - 2017](#)
- [Course Embedded Assessments Gen Ed Goal 4 - 2017](#)
- [Course Embedded Assessments Gen Ed Goal 5 - 2017](#)
- [Assessing General Education Workshop PP Spring 2016](#)
- [Course Embedded Assessments Gen Ed Goal 6 - 2017](#)
- [Initial Breakout of Faculty Participation in Course Embedded Assessment Trends 8-4-2017](#)
- [General Education Program Assessment - Student Success Metrics 6-8-2017](#)
- [Course Embedded Specific Student Learning Assessments Annual Report 8-4-2017](#)
- [General Education Course Embedded Assessment and Student Success Metrics Fall 2017](#)
- [ASSESSMENT Summary for AACU Oral Comm VALUE Rubric AY 2017](#)
- [Assessing General Education Workshop Spring 2016 - Workbook and Checklist](#)
- [General Education Curriculum Mapping Workshop](#)
- [September 2018 Math-Analytical Reasoning Assessment Report.pdf](#)
- [September 2018 Written Communication Assessment Report.pdf](#)
- [September 2018 Critical Thinking Assessment Report.pdf](#)
- [September 2018 Oral Communication Assessment Report.pdf](#)
- [New Faculty Orientation - Entire PDF Document - Fall 2018.pdf](#)
- [General Education Course Embedded Assessment Results AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Basic Assessment Essentials - Foundations for Success.pptx](#)
- [Assessing General Education Workshop Spring 2018 with Checklist at End.docx](#)
- [Basic Assessment Essentials - Workshop Handbook Spring 2018.docx](#)
- [Handout for General Education Workshop - GE Goals-Blooms March 2018.pdf](#)
- [How to Assess and Report General Education Goals Spring 2018.pptx](#)

Program Name: Indirect External Assessments - NSSE/FSSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

Academic Year 2017-2018

In the spring 2018 term, both the NSSE and FSSE surveys were administered. The results files are presented in the file library at the end of this section. In the upcoming 2019 academic year, the data will be analyzed and presented to the General Education Council, along with the various academic units that have an interest in improving their curriculum and student learning experiences.

Academic Year 2016-2017

The use of the NSSE data that was collected in the spring of 2016 is spread across the 2017 and the 2018 academic years. The process of consuming indirect external assessment information is one of the areas where it was determined that information sharing and strategic use of the information to make decisions was an opportunity for improvement. These data were disaggregated by topic and by those items which were significant and presented in power point presentations to share with individual units impacted by the data and findings.

Academic Year 2015-2016

The results from the NSSE and FSSE data show that overall ESU students are satisfied with their educational experiences and enjoy the learning opportunities available in ESU's integrative learning environment (the respective results files for these surveys are attached). The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) supports learning in the general education program by providing feedback related to perspectives on the importance of creating course curriculum that contributes to general education learning goals and the frequencies whereby such contributions occur. Comprehensively, the survey questions address the contexts of the six identified general education

program goals. The curriculum structures relate to inclusion of the goal in the course content, discussion of various goal topics, and the extent to which the course is structured in facilitating student learning and development in general education goals. The survey results show conclusively that faculty embrace the inclusion of general education goals within their course curriculum. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) like the FSSE directly assesses the students perspectives of their educational experiences and benchmarks both freshmen and senior responses to other institutions (Public Plains, Carnegie class, and all participating Institutions). Question 17 asks respondents "how much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?" and goes on to identify those general education goals that are embedded in the ESU courses and co-curricular programming. Students selected significantly higher scores than public plains and Carnegie class institutions on many topics and this was congruent for both freshmen and senior students. There weren't any red flags in the data related to general education goal outcomes. These data can be informative when comparing the perceived educational experiences of ESU students to those of other institutions. This data is shared with the Council on General Education to inform dialogue for improving the program.

Attached Files

- [FSSE14 Administration Summary \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [FSSE14 Frequencies \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [FSSE14 Respondent Profile \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [FSSE14 Topical Module - Civic Engagement \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [FSSE-NSSE Combined Report 2014 \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Administration Summary \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Engagement Indicators \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 High-Impact Practices \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Pocket Guide Report \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Respondent Profile \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Selected Comparison Groups \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Snapshot \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Student Comments \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Topical Module - Civic Engagement \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE14 Topical Module - Civic Engagement Open-Ended Responses \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Topical Module - Development of Transferable Skills](#)
- [NSSE Topical Module-Diverse Perspectives-2016 Results](#)
- [NSSE Topical Module-Transferable Skills-2016 Results](#)
- [NSSE16 Administration Summary \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Engagement Indicators \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 High-Impact Practices \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Multi-Year Report \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Pocket Guide Report \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Respondent Profile \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Selected Comparison Groups \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Snapshot \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE16 Topical Module - Experiences with Diverse Perspectives \(Emporia State\)](#)
- [NSSE Topical Module -Frequencies-and-Statistical-Comparisons-2016 Results.pdf](#)
- [NSSE18 Engagement Indicators \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [FSSE-NSSE Combined Report 2018 \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [FSSE18 Administration Summary \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [NSSE18 Administration Summary \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [FSSE18 Topical Module - Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [FSSE18 Frequencies \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [NSSE18 High-Impact Practices \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [NSSE18 Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [NSSE18 Topical Module - Experiences with Information Literacy \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)
- [NSSE18 Topical Module - Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity \(Emporia State\).xlsx](#)

Program Name: Indirect Internal Assessments - Senior Survey

Summary of Program Assessments:

Academic Year 2017-2018

The Senior Survey results for undergraduates completing their degrees during the 2018 academic year included a response rate of 73.6%, a completion rate of 73.5%, and 290 total respondents. The table shows the results of the scaled items that are included in the indirect assessment of the general education program goals and affiliated topics.

GE Goal Topic: Improved in the following (n=283)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Critical Thinking Skills	51%	46%	1%	1%	.5%
Creative Problem Solving Skills	52%	44%	2%	1%	.5%
Professional Competencies	56%	41%	1%	1%	.5%
Team Building Skills	48%	45%	4%	2%	.5%
Conflict Resolution & Negotiation	46%	47%	5%	1%	.5%
Writing Skills	45%	46%	5%	2%	1%
Confidence in Speaking in Front of Group	48%	43%	7%	1%	1%
Effectively Communicate with another person	52%	45%	1%	1%	1%
Read and Understand Complex Material	45%	51%	2%	1%	1%
Understand and Use Mathematics	34%	42%	13%	6%	5%
Information Literacy	45%	49%	3%	1%	2%
Confident in making Critical Decisions	45%	46%	5%	1%	3%
Appreciation for multiple Academic Disciplines	44%	47%	4%	2%	3%
Understanding of World I live in	41%	52%	4%	1%	2%
Make Connections across Academic Disciplines	40%	54%	4%	1%	1%
Respect and Appreciate Diversity	51%	46%	1%	1%	1%

The open-ended comments suggested that the hourly requirements for the general education program be reduced, so students could take more discipline specific courses. The learning experiences being related to real life and creating meaningful connections to the purposes of the topics being covered in the general education courses was also mentioned. Students also requested more freedom to choose their general education course requirements and a greater variety of programs offered in the general education curriculum.

Academic Year 2016-2017

The overall results of the Senior Survey (N=273; response rate 43.2%) for those students completing bachelor degrees in the 2017 academic year showed that the vast majority of students either agreed or strongly agreed that their skills and knowledge relative to the general education goals had improved. The table shows the results of the scaled items. A graph representation is uploaded in the file library (Senior Survey GE Item Results Graph AY2017).

GE Goal Topic: Improved in the following (n=283)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
Critical Thinking Skills	61%	35%	1%	1%	2%
Creative Problem Solving Skills	56%	41%	1%	1%	1%
Professional Competencies	66%	31%	1%	1%	1%
Team Building Skills	53%	40%	4%	1%	2%
Conflict Resolution & Negotiation	53%	40%	4%	1%	2%
Writing Skills	44%	45%	8%	2%	1%
Confidence in Speaking in Front of Group	51%	40%	7%	1%	1%
Effectively Communicate with another person	52%	41%	5%	1%	1%
Read and Understand Complex Material	52%	39%	7%	1%	1%
Understand and Use Mathematics	36%	44%	13%	4%	3%
Information Literacy	51%	41%	6%	1%	1%
Confident in making Critical Decisions	45%	47%	5%	1%	2%
Appreciation for multiple Academic Disciplines	48%	43%	5%	2%	2%
Understanding of World I live in	48%	43%	5%	1%	3%
Make Connections across Academic Disciplines	48%	45%	4%	1%	2%
Respect and Appreciate Diversity	58%	35%	3%	2%	2%

The themes emerging from the open-ended comments were related to the offering of more online courses, fewer requirements for the general education program, a greater number of faculty teaching courses rather than graduate teaching assistants, the acceptance of more general education course credits completed at other institutions, and avoid larger class sizes. Positively, students voiced appreciation for faculty caring about teaching general education courses and the quality learning environment at the ESU-Kansas City site. The overall results are evidenced in the file library.

Academic Year 2015-2016

The Senior Survey has a bank of questions directly aligned with student learning outcomes for the general education program goals. There were 323 respondents for the undergraduate seniors from the summer 2014, fall 2014, and spring 2015 graduating classes, 206 of which responded to the general education section of the survey. The top 6 majors represented in the survey were Elementary Education (n=92), Secondary Education (n=22), Accounting (n=20), Communication (n=14), Psychology (n=13), Interdisciplinary Studies (n=12), and Biology (n=10). The survey asks about improvement in various skills and knowledge based on learning opportunities at Emporia State University.

The topics covered are critical thinking skills, creative problem solving, professional competencies, team building skills, conflict resolution and negotiation skills, writing skills, verbal communication skills, both one-on-one communication and speaking in front of a group of people, ability to read and understand complex materials, understanding and use of mathematics, evaluate accuracy of information from a variety of different sources, critical decision making skills, and understanding and appreciation of academic disciplines other than major area

of study. In addition, an understanding of the world in which one lives, understanding of connections from one academic discipline to another, a learned respect and appreciation of ideas, values, and lifestyles of people different from self, and a belief that one will have an enriched quality of life. Students consistently select agree or strongly agree on their personal growth and learning related to all of these topics. An open-ended comments section provides descriptive detail of students perceptions and insights into areas for improvement, either in course selection, content, and/or communication of the reasons to have a comprehensive general education program. These data are shared across the institution at many levels (academic, student affairs, general education council, provost's council, administration, faculty teaching general education courses, students, and other interested stakeholders). Many potential areas for improvement are presented in students open-ended comments, as well as continuing what we do well. The Council on General Education has spent quite a bit of time working on conveying the purpose of a general education and the benefits for graduates of these foundations skills. This is a separate topic than improving the actual learning occurring in these courses, but important as well. Survey results are attached as evidence files.

Attached Files

[2016 Senior Survey Gen Eds - Open](#)

[2014 Senior Survey Gen Eds - Open](#)

[2015 Senior Survey Gen Eds - Open](#)

[Senior Survey GE Item Results Graph AY2017](#)

[2017 Senior Survey Gen Eds - Open](#)

[2018 Senior Survey Gen Eds - Open](#)

Program Name: Direct External Assessments - Standardized Tests

Summary of Program Assessments:

Academic Year 2017-2018

In the Fall of 2017, ESU was notified by ACT, Inc. that the CAAP test was being discontinued. We continued to track, analyze, and report CAAP data until the discontinuance in December of 2017. Our next iteration of Direct External Assessments will be to use PRAXIS-CORE data. These tests designed by the Educational Testing Services test student competencies in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics similar to the CAAP tests. The Teachers College education preparation programs require students to have attained competencies in reading, writing, and mathematics prior to admittance to their programs. ESU students who enter with an overall ACT composite score of 22 or above are considered to possess competencies and are not required to demonstrate competencies through the PRAXIS-CORE tests. Tracking, analyzing, and reporting PRAXIS-CORE test results will begin in the spring 2018 term and will be reported beginning in academic year 2019.

Academic Year 2016-2017

In comparing the CAAP results internally, the mean scores for all ESU First-Time students taking the CAAP tests improved in all areas from academic years 2016 to 2017. The mean score for Writing Skills increased from 64.1 to 64.8, the Writing Essay mean score decreased from 3.6 to 2.9, the Mathematics mean score increased from 58.1 to 58.9, and finally the Reading mean score improved from 57.7 to 62.7. The findings from these data are triangulated with the General Education student success metrics report to identify those areas where student learning has improved. The student success metrics are also used to identify key courses for further assessments to determine applicable improvement change strategies. While the CAAP data certainly presents a strong case that ESU general education core skills learning is sound and continuously improving, there is always room for enhancement of student learning. Using the CAAP results to benchmark ESU sophomore students with peers and nationally, the table shows how ESU compares in these two categories (See complete results in file library)

Table: The Percentage of Peer and National Mean Scores at or below ESU Mean Scores

CAAP TEST	Local "Peers"	National "All"
Writing Skills	56.9%	65.5%
Writing Essay	61.4%	85.1%
Mathematics	62.3%	57.8%
Reading	57.2%	49.6%

Academic Year 2015-2016

The ACT-CAAP Linkage studies show that higher percentages of students are scoring at expected and higher than expected levels of growth in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics skills. Since these studies are truly longitudinal and compare a student's performance on ACT tests prior to attendance with performance at a specific point in time during their undergraduate studies, the value added can be measured. As groups of students testing on the CAAP tests since 2004, the trend data shows that ESU students score at or better than those students from

other peer institutions and nationally, more than 50% of the time. And, for most years ESU students score higher than 60% of these institutions. However, recent trends are showing some incremental declines in performance. These declines are on the radar and recent internal course embedded assessments have been added to the mix. Looking at the bench-marking scores and determining that ESU is doing adequate among peers is one thing, but assessing these skills as they are being measured in a course setting brings more depth to the assessment findings as well as carries a lot more leverage in the abilities of the faculty to make timely changes in pedagogy strategies and curriculum. ESU is currently extending course embedded assessment efforts in both written communication and analytical reasoning skills respective to Composition I and II courses and College Algebra courses.

Attached Files

- [CAAP MULTI-YEAR ANALYSIS TREND & STATS 2015](#)
- [CAAP-ACT Linkage Studies for AY2008-AY2012 Baseline Data](#)
- [CAAP-ACT Linkage Studies for AY2013 Data](#)
- [CAAP-ACT Linkage Studies for AY2014 Data](#)
- [CAAP MULTI-YEAR ANALYSIS TREND Data and Graphs STATS 2017](#)
- [CAAP MULTI-YEAR ANALYSIS TREND & STATS 2016](#)
- [CAAP MULTI-YEAR ANALYSIS TREND Data Charts and Graphs as of FALL 2017.pdf](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2017-2018

The recommendations of the initial General Education Assessment Team (GEAT I - 2016) were implemented as applicable during this current academic year. The second year of the General Education Assessment Team's (GEAT II) work is now complete and the affiliated reports are uploaded in the file library. The General Education Council has responded to recommendations and policy changes have ensued. General Education goals 1-3 have been assessed by GEAT and team members for GEAT III have been identified, charged, and will begin their work in August of 2018. They will continue work to complete the next cycle of goal assessment for GE goals 4 and 6. The documentation of this work is shown in the reports and evidence files folder. All of the changes related to General Education Program Assessments are being documented and reported as a function of the General Education Assessment Team activities. General Education faculty have greatly increased their participation in course embedded assessment and reporting for their courses. The policy changes to requiring faculty to assess their general education courses has been beneficial and participation has increased from 93 to 152 individual course assessments during this past year. The campus-wide commitment to assessing the general education program at both the course and goal levels has been productive in improving student learning across the curriculum, and in providing key information for the General Education Council to use when making recommendations for improving the program. Keeping this momentum going will strengthen the program, continuously evolve the program, and prepare students for success in their academic disciplines of study and future career endeavors.

Academic Year 2016-2017

The General Education assessment plan is comprehensive in nature; however it is now evident that additional efforts and resources are being employed to expand assessments to the program level where individual goals are being assessed by faculty groups (GEAT). The report from the Higher Learning Commission provided explicit directives related to expectations for general education program assessment. Over the course of the 2016 academic year, the general education program assessment steering committee engaged in operationalizing these directives. The strategies going forward include the creation of a General Education Assessment Team (GEAT), a Cycle of Assessment whereby all GE Program Goals and Objectives are systemically assessed with recommendations to enhance the program being part of the annual assessment cycle. The documentation of this work is shown in the reports and evidence files folder. All of the changes related to General Education Program Assessments are being documented and tracked as a function of the General Education Assessment Team. Files for the AY 2017 will be uploaded in the file library accordingly.

Academic Year 2015-2016

The general education program assessment plan has both depth and breadth in its reach to ensure that student learning of key core skills is achieved. The strength of the program is in the triangulation of data coming from both internal and external, direct and indirect assessments. The data clearly shows that the program is perceived as successful by students and the direct evidence shows that student learning outcomes are being met. Although, there are some data showing that performances are steadily declining, albeit minimal, there is a decline. It is critical that each faculty member who teaches general education courses participate in assessment of the general education goal(s) taught in their course(s) on an annual basis. The faculty should select an assignment or project from each course and use this as a measurement of student learning success. This will provide directional improvement in one specific area per course. Since assessment is an ongoing process, selecting one specific area to assess per course should be manageable. Over time all parts of the course can be assessed, once one area is

good, then move on to another. Communication of this expectation should be widespread including Provost's Council, Council on General Education, Department Chairs, and Faculty. If we are to consider a course to be continuously included in the general education curriculum, it must be confirmed that the course has curriculum dedicated to general education goals and that student learning of these goals is continuously assessed and improved upon. Collaborative across-discipline assessment efforts linked to a specific general education learning goal(s) is a best practices next step. Progress has been made on these assessments, but efforts are in the infancy and inclusiveness of all disciplines is necessary for assessing those goals where skills are developed over multiple courses such as critical thinking skills and communication (both written and spoken). Those courses having a large number of instructional graduate teaching assistants are vulnerable to inconsistent instruction. These GTA appointments are important contributors to student instruction and to continuing the pipeline of faculty members to the discipline. These appointments can be problematic due to lack of teaching experience and the knowledge of how to manage a classroom setting. There are strong programs in place for ongoing training and learning opportunities for GTA students and it is very important that these mentoring programs and affiliated coursework are consistently assessed and improved upon. All win from a good situation, likewise all lose from a bad one. We must remain proactive and adaptive in GTA mentoring and training. Spending adequate time triangulating the assessment data from the four quadrants (direct/indirect/internal/external) is one of the areas of greatest opportunity. Bringing the assessment data together in this fashion will provide a clear direction of where to prioritize change. Intentionally sharing this information (data findings) with the Council on General Education, with the expectation that direction and expertise will be contributed to addressing and solving problems that arise related to the general education program is essential. The Council on General Education may play a more critical role in the future and take a more proactive approach in perpetuating improvements in the general education program. There is still much work to do, however positive changes in assessment practices and data sharing has improved since spring 2014.

Attached Files

- [General Education Assessment Report - Shanna Eggers Spring 2015](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 4-29-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 5-13-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 5-25-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 6-10-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 7-20-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 8-5-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Charge Spring 2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 3-9-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 4-8-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 4-22-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 4-29-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 5-13-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 5-25-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 6-10-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 7-20-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 8-5-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 3-9-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 4-8-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 4-22-2016](#)
- [Assessment of the Institutional Processes for GE Assessment](#)
- [Curriculum Map from Dept Chair Meetings as of April 2016](#)
- [Gen Ed Assessment Meeting Agenda 07-07-2016 Provost](#)
- [General Education Assessment Committee and Coordinated Efforts 5-9-2016](#)
- [General Education Assessment Planning Review Cycles Summer 2016](#)
- [Memorandum for HLC Directives for Assessing Gen Ed 3-10-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 7-17-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 2-6-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 4-17-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 4-26-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 5-3-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 7-17-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 2-6-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 4-17-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 4-26-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 5-3-2017](#)

- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 3-19-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 8-4-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 3-19-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 8-4-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 1-24-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 1-24-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 7-17-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 7-17-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 FINAL RESULTS - General-Education-Program-Goal-Evaluation-Survey 3-8-2018.pdf](#)

Providing Department: General Education

Responsible Roles: Richard Sleezer (E10000476)

UNIT REPORT

Honors College Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:25 AM

**Honors College Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:**

Vision Statement: The Honors College at Emporia State University aspires to be recognized as a significant catalyst for the improvement of communities in Kansas and beyond.

Mission Statement: The Honors College at Emporia State University will prepare students to be agents of change for the common good in their respective communities.

AY 2019

Opportunities for high impact learning offered by the Honors College continue to evolve and expand with the changing educational landscape. In the fall of 2017, 80% of newly-minted Honors College students who just graduated high school arrive on campus with an average of 21 credits of general education coursework completed while still in high school. This nation-wide trend of students completing increasing number of general education courses while still in high school is influencing many Honors colleges and programs. Combine this trend with the recent Kansas Board of Regents 120 cap on baccalaureate degrees and the result is a decrease in the number of students enrolling in traditional Honors courses, most of which are general education courses. These changes require the Honors College to be adaptive by shifting resources for traditional Honors courses to other high impact venues including Honors contract courses, mentoring, undergraduate research, community engagement opportunities, adaptive leadership training, and domestic and international educational travel.

The Honors College is particularly fortunate to have a cutting-edge contract course strategy that allows students to transform regular courses in their program of study into high impact Honors courses. This option provides students with high impact learning experiences while progressing in Honors without the need to take courses outside of their respective programs of study. The mentoring program continues to grow as does the number of students completing community engagement practicums. The Honors College continues to support more Emporia State University Summer Research Projects (ESURP) than any other organization on campus and the new student lead adaptive leadership training has been very successful. Finally, a number of students successfully complete study abroad experiences including the first annual service learning trip to Uganda.

AY 2018

During the upcoming academic year the Honors College will continue its efforts to provide enhanced leadership development opportunities to its students. This effort will focus on shifting the responsibility for organizing and teaching the two day Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge training experience required of all Honors College students from faculty to students. Significant resources and infrastructure have been put in place to make this happen. The newly implemented faculty-student mentoring program will be promoted. This program that was launched in January 2017, pairs students up with faculty mentors to make progress on academic projects of shared interest. Increases in the number of students and faculty participating in this program are expected. Honors Contract courses will continue to be promoted as a means of expanding curricular opportunities as well as providing mentoring experiences as students work one-on-one with teaching faculty. Finally, an increase in the number of community engagement projects that students complete as they near the end of their academic programs is expected.

AY 2017

While the assessment plan has proved useful, it remains a work-in-progress as adaptations and adjustments continue as needed. Assessment data combined with descriptions of how it will be used to improve student learning are presented in this update. These data align with the following components of the Honors College: 1) adaptive leadership training, 2) community engagement, 3) curriculum, 4) scholarly and creative activities, and 5) learning communities. As the year unfolded, the Honors College remained focused on its vision and mission statements and its plan to capitalize on its core components while allowing for new and unexpected opportunities to be seized.

AY 2016

The assessment plan for the Honors College has been modified to more precisely and accurately measure student learning. This was an outcome of the assessment process whereby we determined a best approach was to combine learning communities, living spaces, and cohorts. The mentoring program was re-designed and relocated under a miscellaneous topic area as this provided flexibility to build new components into the plan as deemed important. The six major categories included are 1) Adaptive Leadership Training; 2) Community Engagement; 3) Curriculum; 4) Scholarly and Creative Activities; 5) Scholarships; and 6) Learning Communities and Cohorts. Several components of the Honors College that were included in last year's assessment report have been eliminated because it was determined that they are not good measures of student learning. These components include learning and living spaces, scholarships, and cohorts.

AY 2015

The Honors College has multiple ways that the success of the programs can be linked to the ESU The Adaptive University strategic plan. The Honors College will be fully established by the end of the 2014-15 academic year. By the end of the 2015-2016 academic year, the Honors College will have completed its first community engagement project with a selected Kansas community. [Emporia State University Honors College Webpage](#)

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:**AY 2018**

During the past academic year, the following progress was recorded: 1) 3 Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenges with students leading the effort were held in which 40 students completed the training. 2) A summer adaptive leadership training experience was offered to high school students and 9 students completed the training. An additional 17 high school students completed the training in a revised high school training effort offered in the spring 2018. 3) The Kansas Honors Connections Conference was once again held on campus with 58 students and faculty from across the state in attendance and 10 ESU students presenting their work. 4) Thirty-eight traditional Honors courses were offered as were 41 contract courses. 5) Fifteen students participated in Honors-sponsored mentoring including 7 ESURP projects. 6) Plans were made for Honors College students to assist with the Family Promise program that provides assistance to area homeless families, funds and canned goods were donated for Corky's Cupboard food pantry during the Spring Ball, and over \$1,000.00 was raised for the Honors Uganda service learning effort. 7) Eighteen students presented their academic work at the Great Plains Honors Council's annual meeting hosted by Oklahoma State University. 8) A team of five students competed in the Collegiate Leadership Competition hosted by FHSU and the team won the Team Process Championship. 9) Six students completed their community engagement practicums. 11) Honors college outings to the Nelson Atkins Museum and the World War I National Museum were held. 12) Six of the 12 of this year's Shepherd Scholar winners were Honors College students including the winner of the Roe R. Cross Scholarship (Houng Tran). 13) The Newberg Outstanding Senior (Andy Renteria) and Distinguished Senior (Grayce McAllister) were both Honors College students. 14) Three students graduated either With Honors or With High Honors in December of 2017 as did an additional 7 students in May of 2018. 15) Five Honors College students participated in the first annual service learning trip to Uganda (6 weeks).

AY 2017

In reviewing the past academic year, the following progress was recorded: 1) 3 Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenges were held (two in the fall and one in the spring) with forty-four students completing the training. 2) The first community engagement project was completed. 3) The Kansas Honors Connections Conference was held on campus (November 5) and 59 students from across the state participated with 15 students from ESU presenting their work. 4) Seven students attended the National Collegiate Honors Council's annual meeting in Seattle with all students presenting poster or oral presentations. 5) Community service projects were completed including the construction of a Born Learning Trail in Lebo, Kansas, a bone marrow registration drive (with Dept. of Biology), and a fundraiser for the Kansas Livestock Foundation (\$70.00). 6) Seventeen traditional Honors courses and 14 Honors contract courses were offered in the fall and 15 traditional Honors courses and 25 Honors contract courses were offered in the spring. 7) Five students and 4 faculty mentors participated in the new mentoring program. 8) 17 students presented their academic work at the Great Plains Honors Council's annual meeting at Lamar University in Beaumont, Texas, where Alexandra Ewy won a poster award. 9) Honors College students presence on campus expanded with 6 of 12 Shepherd Scholars students being members of the Honors College, both the Newberg Outstanding Senior (Christopher Alderman) and the Distinguished Senior (Brandon Schrader) were members of the Honors College, and Honors College student Megan McReynolds was elected ASG president for the 2017-18 academic year. 10) Finally, 1 student graduated "With Honors" in December 2016, and 16 students graduated "With Honors" or "With High Honors" in the spring of 2017. The spring graduation number is very encouraging as it reflects a growing number of students who are remaining engaged in Honors and are completing the program.

This coming year the following will occur:) The first Honors College service learning experience in Uganda will be completed. 2) A plan to

recruit more minority students into the Honors College will be implemented although it will take more than a single year to produce the desired results. 3) The Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge will include students as instructors with faculty serving in support roles. 4) It is anticipated that multiple community engagement projects will be completed. 5) The number of students and faculty participating in the mentoring program will increase.

AY 2016

Looking back on the 2015-16 academic year, progress was made on the following goals: 1) Three Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenges were held on campus with thirty Honors College students completing the training. 2) The new requirements for graduating "with honors" were implemented. 3) Paper and poster nominations were submitted to the Great Plains Honors Council and ESU students won in each category with Christopher Alderman winning a Boe Award and Ashlea Chapman winning a Poster Award. 4) The mentoring strategy is currently being refined and will be implemented in the fall of 2016. 5) The Scholar's Floor experience was evaluated and it was determined that the current strategy is working very well. We will continue to provide this opportunity to our students with the possibility of establishing a second floor in future years. 6) Data are being gathered measuring student persistence in Honors with a growing number of students completing the adaptive leadership training experience, completing Honors courses and contract courses, and participating in Honors Activities. 7) The first Honors College sponsored Bonner and Bonner Diversity Lecture Series: Civic Leadership for the Common Good was held featuring renowned educator and author Dr. Freeman Hrabowski.

Looking forward to the 2016-17 academic year, 1) four Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenges will be held with at least forty-five students completing the training. 2) The first community engagement projects (CW 510) will be completed by at least one Honors College student. 3) A new study abroad experiences where Honors College students will travel to Uganda and perform service for the M-LISADA orphanage will be completed in June of 2017. 4) The new mentoring program will be fully implemented fall of 2016. 5) Honors College growth will be monitored and evaluated in an effort to determine if caps need to be set in order to keep growth manageable. 6) Effort will be made to revised and clarify the cohort/learning community strategy of the Honors College as more progress need to be made in this area.

AY 2015

During the 2015-16 academic year the following progress will be made: 1) ESU Kansas Leadership Center Faculty in Residence and select Honors College students will sponsor at least three "You! Lead! Now!" civic leadership training experiences on campus with at least thirty-five Honors College students completing the training. 2) The Adaptive Leadership Summer Challenge for high school students from Kansas communities will be expanded to include at least one session with sixteen or more students enrolled. If possible, a second session will be held with students from other high schools (non Blue Valley) attending. Honors College students will empower participants to work on adaptive challenges in their home schools and communities and will devise a strategy for following up with participants on their challenges. 3) The new requirements for graduating "With Honors" will be implemented. 4) Two essay and/or poster presentations will be submitted for award consideration at the 2016 Great Plains Honors Conference annual meeting. 5) Using recently gathered assessment data, the Honors College mentoring program will be adjusted so that students may self select mentors based on interests and needs. A baseline for student mentor activities will be established. 6) In cooperation with Residence Life, implement and assess the revised Scholars Floor effort in the Residence Halls. Effort will be made to provide a cohort-based shared learning and living experience. 7) Establish baseline data for student persistence in the Honors College including the completion of civic leadership training, the completion of Honors curricula, and participation in other Honors College Activities. 8) Recruit at least forty-five students for the 2016-17 class. 9) Plan, organize, execute and assess the first Honors College sponsored "Bonner and Bonner Civic Leadership for the Common Good Diversity Lecture."

Attached Files

[HON_COL_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)

[Wyatt-Gary-CW111-FA17.pdf](#)

[Wyatt-Gary-CW111-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name: Adaptive Leadership Training

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

Based on assessment and other data, during the upcoming year, the following adjustments are planned to the adaptive leadership training effort.

1) The Honors Adaptive leadership training lead by students will be offered at the beginning of each semester as opposed to during weekends when the semester is underway. This decision came after considerable thought and discussion with all members of the Honors College.

2) The high school leadership training experience will NOT be offered as a summer camp, but will be offered while class is in session to select area high schools free of charge during. This option was piloted this past semester with great success.

3) In addition to CW 111 and 311, facilitate leadership and leadership competition courses were offered to students. The leadership competition course lead to the student participants winning a trophy at the regional Collegiate Leadership Competition.

AY 2017

Three adaptive leadership challenges were held throughout the academic year with two in the fall and one in the spring. A total of 44 students completed the training. Two Summer Adaptive Leadership Summer camps (2016) were held for high school students with a total of 22 students completing the camps. The participant evaluations of these camps pointed to their overall effectiveness. Based on enrollment for the summer 2017 camps, a tentative decision, contingent on funding, is to approach select high schools and offer the experience as a community service.

While the participant evaluations of these events were high, an overall assessment has prompted future change whereby select Honors College student will assume more responsibility for direct instruction in both the summer camps and the Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge and Kansas Leadership Center Faculty-in-Residence will assume support roles. Select Honors College students have already received instruction and preparation for the 2017 summer camp and academic year training events.

AY 2016

Due to the unique needs of the Honors College, a training experience replacing the Kansas Leadership Center's You! Lead! Now! was designed and implemented this year. This experience entitled the Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge was designed by the Director of the Honors College and was staffed by the Kansas Leadership Center Faculty in Residence at ESU. During the past academic year three Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge events were held on campus in which 30 students completed the training. An assessment of this training experience attests to its suitability and overall effectiveness for Honors College students.

Forty-three students completed CW 111, Honors Seminar I, a course required of all Honors students that includes adaptive leadership training throughout. Faculty assessment of student learning is included as an attachment under curriculum.

AY 2015

Faculty at ESU and at the Kansas Leadership Center will provide training to students that will enable them to join with others in addressing the challenges of the day. During the spring semester of 2015 two groups of Honors College students totaling twenty-seven students completed the Kansas Leadership Center's You! Lead! Now! training experience. This is a three-day training event that immerses participants into the principles and competencies of civic leadership. An assessment survey for the You! Lead! Now! experience will be implemented in the fall semester.

Twelve Honors College students completed CW 111 Honors Seminar I which had civic leadership principles and competencies embedded throughout the course including two major term projects and four assignments. Faculty assessment of student learning for this course is included as an attachment in the "Honors Curriculum" section of this report.

Attached Files

- [FL 2016 Summary - Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge](#)
- [SP 2017 Summary - Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge](#)
- [SU 2016 Summer Leadership Assessment by Campers](#)
- [AY 2016 - Leadership Training Assessment SUMMARY](#)
- [FL 2017 Summary-Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge.pdf](#)
- [SP 2018 Summary-Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge.pdf](#)
- [SU 2017 Summer Leadership Assessment by Campers.pdf](#)
- [SP 2018 Leadership training for high school students - assessment by participants.pdf](#)

Program Name: Community Engagement

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

During the upcoming year, no changes are planned as the community engagement effort is moving forward successfully.

1) Six students have completed community engagement projects that include an oral history of area veterans, the implementation of a multi-campus leadership training effort, a project strengthening music training in a local middle school, and join effort of creating a website for

economic development for Ruboni, a village in the Rwenzori Mountains of western Uganda.

- 2) The groundwork has been laid for Honors College involvement in support of Promise Keepers of the Flint Hills, an organization that supports area homeless families.
- 3) A host of community engagement projects are being planned for community in the region and in Uganda.

AY 2017

During the past academic year the following community service activities occurred:

1. The first, CW 510 Community Engagement Project, was completed by Honors College students Candace Cote and Camille Abdel-Jawad. The project involved the development of the "Traditions Keepers" program at ESU and was a joint effort between these students and the ESU Foundation. The program will continue to enrich the lives of students into the future.
2. Honors College student Christopher Alderman and the Honors College in conjunction with the Department of Biology sponsored a bone marrow registration drive. Honors College facilities were used for the event.
3. Under the Student Honors Council service chair Erynn Dahlke and in conjunction with the United Way of the Flint Hills, Honors College students helped with the construction of a Born Learning Trail in Lebo, Kansas.
4. Funds from the Honors College spring Ball were donated to the Kansas Livestock Foundation to help them defray costs to area ranchers as a consequence of grass fires that destroyed pastures throughout the state. The funds totaled \$70.00.
5. During the spring semester, extensive preparations for the first annual Honors College service learning 6-week trip to Uganda occurred. Much of the preparation took place in Honors Course CW 300 Global Problems taught by sociologist David Westfall, a course required of all those who planned to participate. Connections with two Uganda-based organization, EduKey Gender Support Organization in Kampala, Uganda, and the Ruboni Childcare Initiative in the village of Ruboni, Uganda, were made. Both of these organizations focus on child education and gender equity issues. The Honors College approached Instructional Technology, and Libraries and Archives, to procure 16 retired but serviceable laptop computers and a number of library books suitable for children and adults to donate to these organizations. The students prepared adaptive leadership training and certification experiences for both organizations. Funds were privately raised that will be given to these organizations during the trip.

AY 2016

During the past year, students engaged with local communities in providing a number of services which included:

1. Providing the Adaptive Leadership Summer Challenge to high school students from 7 different High Schools in 4 different communities: Emporia, Hutchison, Overland Park, and Strong City.
2. Physical Science students aligned with the Honors sponsored SENCER Organization provided Radon, water and soil testing for area residents.
3. Math students provided a learning experience for area elementary school students at the Emporia Public Library.
4. The Director of the Honors College will visit the M-LISADA orphanage in Kampala, Uganda, and lay the foundation for an annual service learning international educational experience for Honors College students to serve the children at that facility. The first month-long trip will be scheduled for June of 2017 and will hopefully involve about 10 students.
5. The Director also worked with the Student Honors Council and the Director of Flint Hills United Way to lay the groundwork for local community service projects organized by the Honors College to be held one each semester. The first project will occur during the fall of 2016 and will involve service to the community of Lebo, Kansas.

AY 2015

Students will engage with a variety of Kansas communities to address adaptive issues and engage in civic leadership and service learning. Students may eventually engage communities beyond Kansas to provide knowledge and perspective useful for enriching both Kansas communities and their personal lives. During the spring of 2015, six Honors College Students laid the foundation for our first major community engagement project by traveling to the Center for Professional Studies (CAPS) of the Blue Valley School District in Overland Park, Kansas, and working with the faculty and students there to develop a two day summer adaptive leadership challenge that will be offered to CAPS high school students in July of 2015. These Honors College students completed a major project for CW 111 Honors Seminar I designing this experience.

Also during spring semester of 2015, ten Honors College students prepared documents for distribution to all elementary school children in USD 253 for the Emporia Area Natural Resources Conservation Council about the city's upcoming curbside recycling effort. The Project was completed in April and involved eleven students working about four hours each.

Attached Files

[SU 2015 Summer Leadership Camp Participants](#)

[SU 2017 Uganda Service Learning assessment.pdf](#)

[SU 2017 Summer Leadership Assessment by Campers.pdf](#)

[SP 2018 Leadership training for high school students - assessment by participants.pdf](#)

Program Name: Curriculum

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

A major shift away from traditional Honors courses both here at ESU and across the nation is occurring due to the increasing number of students who arrive on campus having completed many of their general education courses. Because the foundation of many honors offerings are general education honors courses, this trend is leading to a drop in enrollments in Honors courses despite the strong demand for Honors College membership. Combine this trend with the recent Regents-imposed cap of 120 credit hours on most bachelors degrees and the accompanying desire of students (and their parents) graduate as efficiently as possible with minimal credits and expense, and the desire of students to take Honors courses outside of their program of study diminishes as well. These realities strongly suggest that the Honor's College strategy for contract courses where regular courses in student's programs of study can be converted into high impact Honors courses was very fortunate. Over the past academic year, 41 Honors contract courses have been offered with assessment data supporting their effectiveness. There were a total of 38 traditional honors courses, including practicums and thesis. The point is that that based on this

AY 2017

1. Summer 2016: 1 hours independent study course.
2. Fall 2016: 17 traditional Honors courses and 14 Honors contract courses were offered.
3. Spring 2017: 15 traditional Honors courses and 25 Honors contact courses were offered.

Honors contract courses will continue to be emphasized in the future as they are proving to be an effective means by which students can convert courses in their program of study into Honors courses and by which students can have meaningful mentoring experiences with faculty.

AY 2016

Assessment data from the Honors courses offered during the academic year are included below. These data demonstrate that instructors aligned course content with the characteristics of an Honors Course at ESU that have been identified by the Honors College. As required by Honors College policy, instructors provided some evidence that 1) the content of the course was measurably broader, deeper, or more complex than non-Honors versions of the same course, and 2) the content promoted civic leadership, community engagement, and/or pursuit of the common good. Again as consistent with Honors College policy most instructors provided evidence that course content addressed at least two of the following objectives: 3) included a distinctive learned-directed environment; 4) helped the student develop effective written, oral, and/or interpersonal communication skills; 5) enabled the students to become critical and independent thinkers; 6) develop collaborative relationships with faculty and other students; or 7) produce a scholarly or creative product suitable for sharing with others through some scholarly venue. Assessment data is attached.

AY 2015

Traditional honors courses and honors contract courses will be offered. These courses will provide a rich and broad educational experience to students that will assist them in achieving their academic potentials. Guidelines for Honors College courses focusing on academic excellence, civic leadership and community engagement were established and distributed campus-wide. Sixteen new Honors College courses were approved and added to the curriculum. The assessment of these courses is ongoing and reported on an annual or term basis depending on when and with what frequency the course is taught. The assessments for spring semester are attached.

Attached Files

[BE 573 AZ - T. Thornton - FL 2016](#)

[BU 293 AZ - S. Lovett - FL 2016](#)

[CW 111 AZ & BZ - G. Wyatt - FL 2016](#)

[CW 311 A - R. Rowley - FL 2016](#)

[EC 102 AZ - R. Catlett - FL 2016](#)

[EG 103 AZ BZ - T. Mix - FL 2016](#)

[EG 104 AZ - T. Mix - FL 2016](#)

[EG 594 AZ - R. Spaulding - FL 2016](#)

[GB 170 AZ - M. Sundberg - FL 2016](#)
[HL 150 DZ - K. Mathews - FL 2016](#)
[LR 280 DZ - C. Stephens - FL 2016](#)
[MA 162 DZ - B. Yanik - FL 2016](#)
[MA 451 ZA - B. Yanik - FL 2016](#)
[MK 462 AZ - J. Zhou - FL 2016](#)
[MU 226 BZ - C. Bergman - FL 2016](#)
[PS 516 AZ - C. Aguirre-Mendez - FL 2016](#)
[PY 503 AZ - J. Wade - FL 2016](#)
[SA 339 AZ - L. Perez - FL 2016](#)
[SUMMARY FL 2016 Faculty Assessment of Student Learning](#)
[AC 413 AZ - G. Durler - SP 2017](#)
[BE 303 - T. Thornton - SP 2017](#)
[BU 353 AZ - S. Lovett - SP 2017](#)
[CH 126AZ, 127AZ, 127CZ -D. Nutbrown, Q. Zhang - SP 2017](#)
[CH 127 AZ - Q. Zhang - SP 2017](#)
[CW 300 AZ - D. Westfall - SP 2017](#)
[CW 311 - E. Blocker - SP 2017](#)
[EC 102 AZ - R. Catlett - SP 2017](#)
[ED 220 AZ - P. Bland - Sp 2017](#)
[EG 104 AZ - T. Mix - SP 2017](#)
[EG 104 BZ - T. Mix - SP 2017](#)
[EG 220 ZZ - C Patton - SP 2017](#)
[EG 515 AZ - K. OMeara - SP 2017](#)
[EG 520 AZ - R. Spaulding - SP 2017](#)
[EG 565 AZ - G. Robinson - SP 2017](#)
[GB 303 AZ - B. Koerner - SP 2017](#)
[GE 101 AZ - D. Hann - SP 2017](#)
[HL 150 CZ - E. Witte - SP 2017](#)
[HL 150 ZZ - A. Avery - SP 2017](#)
[ID 301 AZ - M. Koci - SP 2017](#)
[MA 380 AZ - B. Hollenbeck - SP 2017](#)
[MU 226 BZ - C. Bergman - SP 2017](#)
[PO 400 AZ - P. Kelly - SP 2017](#)
[RE 540 AZ - E.B. Kessler - SP 2017](#)
[SA 235 ZZ - L Perez - SP 2017](#)
[SA 379 - R. Spaulding - SP 2017](#)
[SP 101 AZ H. Hamilton](#)
[SUMMARY - SP 2017 Faculty Assessment of Student Learning](#)
[CW 111 AZ - G Wyatt - FL 2015](#)
[CW 210 AZ - G Robinson - FL 2015](#)
[CW 311 AZ - W Clamurro - FL 2015](#)
[EC 102 AZ - R Catlett - FL 2015](#)
[EC 300 AZ - R Catlett - FL 2015](#)
[EG 103 AZ,BZ - T Mix - FL 2015](#)
[EG 104 AZ - T Mix - FL 2015](#)
[EG 360 AZ - D Colson - FL 2015](#)
[GB 170 AZ - M Sundberg - FL 2015](#)
[HL 150 AZ - E Blocker - FL 2015](#)
[ID 301 AZ - M Koci - FL 2015](#)
[MA 410 BZ - B Hollenbeck - FL 2015](#)
[MU 226 BZ - C Bergman - FL 2015](#)
[PI 225 AZ - C Brown - FL 2015](#)
[PY 503 AZ - J Wade - FL 2015](#)
[SA 314 AZ - L Perez - FL 2015](#)
[SP 101 AZ - K Reeves - FL 2015](#)

- [SUMMARY Report - FL 2015 Faculty Assessment of Student Learning](#)
- [BU 293 AZ - S. Lovett - SP 2016](#)
- [BU 353 AZ - S Lovett - SP 2016](#)
- [CH 127 AZ,BZ,CZ - D Nutbrown - SP 2016](#)
- [CW 111 AZ Honors Seminar I - Wyatt - SP 2016](#)
- [CW 111 BZ Honors Seminar I - Wyatt - SP 2016](#)
- [CW 311 AZ - R Rowley - SP 2016](#)
- [ED 220 AZ - P Bland - SP 2016](#)
- [EG 241 AZ - Dan Colson - SP 2016](#)
- [EG 540 AZ - R Spaulding - SP 2016](#)
- [GB 303 AZ - B Koerner - SP 2016](#)
- [HL 566 AZ - E Witte - SP 2016](#)
- [ID 301 AZ - M Koci - SP 2016](#)
- [MA 162 AZ - E Yanik - SP 2016](#)
- [MA 162 AZ - Yanik - additional data](#)
- [MC 459 AZ - T Burnett - SP 2016](#)
- [MU 226 BZ - C Bergman SP 2016](#)
- [MU 371 DZ - D McConkie - SP 2016](#)
- [SA 379 AZ - R Spaulding - SP 2016](#)
- [SA 399 AZ - G Robinson - SP 2016](#)
- [SUMMARY Report - SP 2016 Faculty Assessment of Student Learning](#)
- [CW 111 AZ - G Wyatt - FL 2015](#)
- [CW 210 AZ - G Robinson - FL 2015](#)
- [CW 311 AZ - W Clamurro - FL 2015](#)
- [EC 102 AZ - R Catlett - FL 2015](#)
- [EC 300 AZ - R Catlett - FL 2015](#)
- [EG 103 AZ,BZ - T Mix - FL 2015](#)
- [EG 104 AZ - T Mix - FL 2015](#)
- [EG 360 AZ - D Colson - FL 2015](#)
- [GB 170 AZ - M Sundberg - FL 2015](#)
- [HL 150 AZ - E Blocker - FL 2015](#)
- [ID 301 AZ - M Koci - FL 2015](#)
- [MA 410 BZ - B Hollenbeck - FL 2015](#)
- [MU 226 BZ - C Bergman - FL 2015](#)
- [PI 225 AZ - C Brown - FL 2015](#)
- [PY 503 AZ - J Wade - FL 2015](#)
- [SA 314 AZ - L Perez - FL 2015](#)
- [SP 101 AZ - K Reeves - FL 2015](#)
- [SUMMARY Report - FL 2015 Faculty Assessment of Student Learning](#)
- [BU 293 AZ Ethics, Social Resp, and Sustainability - fall course](#)
- [BU 505 Special Topics - Dynamic Business Leadership](#)
- [CW 210 ZA Intro to Latin America - fall course](#)
- [EC 300 Honors Pro-seminar - Poverty - fall course](#)
- [MA 410 PC A Tour of Infinity - fall course](#)
- [MU 226 BZ Music Appreciation Film Music - fall course](#)
- [MU 226 ZA Music Appreciation - History of Rock-Roll - summer course](#)
- [MU 226 ZZ Music Appreciation - History of Rock-Roll - fall course](#)
- [MU 324 A World Music - summer course](#)
- [PY 503 AZ The Psychology of You - fall course](#)
- [SA 314 AZ Spanish Lang-Culture IV - fall course](#)
- [SO 101 ZA Intro to Sociology - fall course](#)
- [SO 261 Intimate Relationships - fall course](#)
- [SUMMARY report - Honors course proposal evaluations - SP 2015](#)
- [GB 170 AZ Honors Biology \(M Sundberg\)](#)
- [MA 392 AZ Intro to Image & Audio Proc \(Q Shi\)](#)
- [PO 4001 AZ Honors Seminar Intntl Relations Theory \(P Kelly\)](#)

- [Brooks - CW 300 SALC Camp leader SU 2015](#)
- [Fuller - CW 300 SALC Camp leader SU 2015](#)
- [Renteria - CW 300 SALC Camp leader SU 2015](#)
- [Stevens - CW 300 SALC Camp leader SU 2015](#)
- [Summary Report - SALC Camp leader SU 2015](#)
- [EG 104 AZ - T. Mix - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [AR 225 AZ - M. Dolembro - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [BU 293 AZ - S. Lovett - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [BU 353 BZ - S. Lovett - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [BU 301 ZZ - T. Thornton - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [EG 592 AZ K. Kienholz - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [EG 103 AZ,BZ - T. Mix - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [EC 102 AZ - R Catlett, R Selby - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [EL 416 BZ - M. Reed - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [GB 170 AZ - M. Sundberg - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [GE 454 AZ - D. Hann - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [ID 301 AZ - M. Koci - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [LR 170 AZ - C. Stephens - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [MA 162 DZ - C. Wiley - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [GE 101 AZ - D. Hann - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [MC 226 CZ - C. Bergman - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [MG 301 BZ - C. Stone - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [MU 324 AZ - T. Freeze - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [PI 225 AZ - C. Brown - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [PO 100 AZ - P. Kelly - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [PY 503 AZ - J. Wade - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [SA 313 AZ - R. Spaulding - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [RE 541 AZ - E.B. Kessler - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [SP 101 AZ - H. Hamilton - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [SP 400 AZ - T. Vik - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [SP 441 AZ - M. Dennis - FL 2017.pdf](#)
- [2017 FL SUMMARY - Faculty assesment of student learning.pdf](#)
- [BU 301 BZ - M. Worthing - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [CW 311 - R. Rowley - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [AR 411 AZ - D. Wilkinson - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [CH 126 AZ - C. Peroza - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [CW 111 AZ - G. Wyatt - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [AR 324 BZ - D. Griner - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [CW 111 BZ - M. Shivley - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [EG 583 AZ - A. Webb - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [CW 300 AZ - D. Westfall - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [EG 585 AZ - K. Rabas - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [EL 310 AZ - S. Metzger - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [MA 162 AZ - B. Hollenbeck - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [ID 301 AZ - M. Koci - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [GB 459 BZ - E. Martin - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [MC 316 AZ - S. Fields - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [MG 301 AZ - C. Stone - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [MU 226 AZ - D. McConkie - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [MU 344 BZ - T. Ziek - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [PO 100 AZ - P. Kelly - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [MU 371 AZ - T. Freeze - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [PS 115 AZ - S. Capes - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [PY 211 C - C. Koehn - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [PY 403 AZ - C. Grover - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [SA 313 AZ - G. Robinson - SP 2018.pdf](#)

- [SP 101 FZ - K. Reeves - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [EC 102 AZ - R. Catlett and B. Selby - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [EL 250 AZ - L. Mann - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [EG 103 AZ - T. Mix - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [EG 104 AZ - T. Mix - SP 2018.pdf](#)
- [2018 SP SUMMARY - Faculty assessment of student learning.pdf](#)

Program Name: Scholarly and Creative Activities

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

1. A record 18 students presented their academic work at the Great Plains Honors Conference hosted by Oklahoma State University.
2. Ten students presented their work at the Kansas Honors Connections Conference, at ESU.
3. Thirty Honors College students presented their work at Research and Creativity Day.
4. Six students won Shephard Scholar awards.
5. The Newberg Outstanding Senior and Distinguished Senior awards were both won by Honors College students.
6. Seven Honors College students completed ESURP projects funded by the Honors College.
7. Eight Honors College students completed student faculty mentored projects funded by the Honors College.
8. Two Honors thesis were completed by Honors College students.

Assessment data suggest that preparation for, and participation at the Great Plains Honors Conference is a very rewarding experience for Honors College students. This activity will continue to be emphasized. The mentoring program implemented last year shows promise as well.

AY 2017

1. During the summer of 2016, 2 Honors College students attended the National Collegiate Honors Council and National Park Service's Partners in the Parks Program.
2. Seven Honors College students with faculty mentors completed Emporia State University Summer Research Program (ESURP) experiences.
3. The Kansas Honors Connections Conference was held on campus (November 5) and 59 students from across the state participated with 15 students from ESU presenting their work.
4. Seven students attended the National Collegiate Honors Council's annual meeting in Seattle with all students presenting poster or oral presentations.
5. Eighteen students presented their academic work at the Great Plains Honors Council's annual meeting at Lamar University in Beaumont, Texas.
6. Alexandra Ewy won one of the Great Plains Honors Council's Poster Awards for her poster presentation at the annual conference, at Lamar University in Beaumont, TX.
7. Five students and 4 faculty mentors participated in the new Honors College mentoring program.
8. Six of 12 Shepherd Scholar awards were presented to Honors College students.
9. The 2016-17 Newberg Outstanding Senior award was presented to Honors College student Christopher Alderman.
10. The 2016-17 Distinguished Senior award was presented to Honors College Brandon Schrader.
11. One student graduated "With Honors" in December 2016, and 16 students graduated "With Honors" or "With High Honors" in the May 2017.

AY 2016

Presentations at professional meetings:

- Kansas Honors Collections Conference: Ten students presented academic papers.
- Great Plains Honors Council Conference: Seven students presented academic papers; three students presented academic posters; Seven students served as moderators.
Christopher Alderman won a Boe Award for this paper; Ashlea Chapman won a poster award for her poster.
- Research and Creativity Day (ESU): Seven students presented academic papers; twenty-one students presented academic posters.
- Emporia State University Summer (2015) Undergraduate Research Program (ESURP): five faculty/student mentored projects were funded.
- Partners in the Parks (NCHC/National Park Service Learning): Three students attended and completed the experience.
- Science Education for New Civic Engagement and Responsibility (SENCER) 2015 Summer Institute: Two faculty members and three students attended and completed the experience.

Attached Files

- [SP 2017 - GPHC Summary Report](#)
- [FL 2016 NCHC Conference Summary](#)
- [SU 2016 - NCHC Partners in Parks](#)
- [SU 2016 - SENCER Experience Summary](#)
- [GPHC Conference SP 2016 - Summary Report](#)
- [NCHC Conference FL 2015 - Summary Report](#)
- [NCHC Partners in the Parks SU 2015 - Summary Report](#)
- [SENCER - Summer 2015 - Summary Report](#)
- [GPHC 2015 Conference - Summary Report](#)
- [2018 SP - GPHC Summary Report 1.pdf](#)
- [SU 2017 ESURP summer project assessments - HC Students only.pdf](#)

Program Name: Scholarships

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

A total of 144 students received Honors College scholarships. This number compares with last year as there were 55 new students included in this number that were not included in last year's total. Scholarship amount totals \$78,086.00 for the year. Honors College students continue to emphasize the value of these scholarships as motivation for progressing in Honors.

AY 2016

Ninety-four student received member scholarships for a total of \$46,250.00 this academic year. Evidence from interviews with Honors College students indicate that the scholarships are a significant motivation for joining and progressing in Honors.

AY 2015

Students will be provided annual, renewable scholarships contingent on satisfactory progress in meeting Honors College requirements. A new scholarship program for Honors College students was implemented along with guidelines for eligibility and renewal. Ninety-eight students including fifty new students qualify for, and will receive Honors College scholarships in the fall of 2015.

Program Name: Learning Communities and Cohorts

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The focus of the Honors College will shift to mentoring relationships between students and faculty and students and each other as opposed to specific learning communities and/or cohorts. This decision is informed by last year's assessment report below.

AY 2017

Work remains to be done on exploring learning communities and how they might be most successfully employed to enhance the experience of Honors College students. Learning communities are defined as "a group of people who share common academic goals and attitudes, and who meet semi-regularly to collaborate on academic work." On many campuses learning communities are aligned with a cohort-based strategy where groups of students enroll in the same courses each semester and help each other. This I have learned is not feasible here. Furthermore, other efforts to establish learning communities including the Scholars Floor and Adaptive Leadership Training experiences have not really worked either. Questions about whether learning communities as defined above can, or should be, established in the Honors College will be explored in more detail. A task force of students and faculty will meet this coming semester to explore the viability of learning communities in Honors in more detail.

AY 2016

A new and better strategy for the creation and functioning of learning communities needs to be designed and implemented as current efforts have been inadequate. With the aid of the Honors College Advisory Council and the Student Honors Council, a new strategy will be designed and implemented during the 2016-2017 academic year.

AY 2015

A modern, technologically enhanced space will be provided to students that will facilitate academic achievement and social cohesion.

Students will also have the opportunity to live in an Honors College residential facility. Effort to establish learning cohorts continues with refinement and improvement needed. A record twenty-five Honors College students will reside on the Scholars Floor in the Residence Halls during the 2015-2016 academic year where a learning community will be established.

The Office of Residential Life in consultation with the Honors College is in the process of finalizing an extensive set of learning experiences for these students. The Honors College Engagement Center in White Library 307 was completed and opened for use in November of 2014. Technological devices for measuring the frequency of use will be implemented in the fall of 2015. A dedicated Scholars Floor on the Residence Halls has been redesigned with emphasis on establishing a learning cohort and enhanced academic-based activities. A record twenty-five new Honors College students will reside on the floor during the upcoming academic year.

Attached Files

- [📄 AY 2017 HCEC Access Summary](#)
- [📄 AY 2017 Scholars Residential Report](#)
- [📄 Fall 2015 - Scholars Residential Report](#)
- [📄 Spring 2016 - Scholars Residential Report](#)
- [📄 WL 307 Access Summary - Sp 2016](#)

Program Name: Miscellaneous

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The Honors Program welcomed 55 new members for a total of 169 members. Based on past experience, the decision has been made to limit new members to 50 per year. We believe this is sustainable.

The Honors College has hired a part-time faculty member with expertise in adaptive leadership training. This person will be responsible for overseeing and supporting the Honors Adaptive Leadership Challenge and the High School Adaptive leadership Challenge. As such, this person will teach the facilitated leadership course and the leadership competition course once each year. Finally, this person will also teach a section of CW 111 and 311 as well as supervise the CW 510 community engagement practicums.

The Director of the Honors College has had his position changed to Dean of the Honors College. He is completing his service as President of the Great Plains Honors Council.

AY 2017

The Honors College welcomed 64 new members in August of 2016 for a total of 172 students. The Director expressed concerns about the sustainability of such a large number and as a result a target of between 40 and 50 new admits was established. A more manageable Fifty-seven students are admitted for the coming fall, 7 students above the maximum target but 7 below last year's number. This more manageable number was achieved by establishing an earlier application deadline.

The new mentoring program was launched in January and the 5 students working on mentoring projects have reported positive experiences and I'm convinced that the Honors College is on the right path with this strategy. While the program is expected to grow each semester mentoring is happening in other ways most notably the Honors Contract courses and ESURP projects.

Providing an annual service learning trip to Uganda where the Honors College will partner with EduKey Gender Support Organization in Kampala, and the Ruboni Child Care Initiative in Ruboni, will continue. The possibility of student participants identifying and completing CW 510 Community Engagement Practicums in Uganda is very high and will provide a global perspective to this essential Honors College experience.

The Director of the Honors College was elected President-Elect of the Great Plains Honors Council in the fall.

AY 2016

Mentoring:

A new mentoring strategy will be implemented in the fall semester. This new strategy focuses on students selecting mentors based on shared goals. The goal could be a mentored research project, creative work, performance or comparable effort. It may or may not involve university credit. Faculty mentors would receive a stipend and Honors College students would likely receive and Honors point towards graduation with honors for completing the project.

AY 2015

Mentoring:

Students will experience peer, faculty, and community mentoring as they complete undergraduate research, scholarship, creative, and leadership activities. A mentoring program involving thirteen faculty mentors was implemented with Honors College students randomly assigned to each member. While this effort had some success, there were problems that required adjustment. A meeting to assess this program was held with mentors at the end of spring semester. This meeting led to adoption of new strategies for matching students with mentors, and mentor involvement for the coming academic year, including:

- 1) Students will not be randomly assigned to mentors, rather mentors will be available for students to choose from with students having more than one mentor if they choose.
- 2) Mentors will be encouraged to participate in all Honors College activities.

The Honors College provided funding for four summer undergraduate research projects in 2015.

Attached Files

- [Mentor Hosted Activities](#)
- [Breanna Gilger project - 2017-18.pdf](#)
- [Brettany Williams project - 2017-18.pdf](#)
- [Aidan Johnson - P. Kelly, G. Yancey - 2017-18.pdf](#)
- [AY 2018 SUMMARY - student-faculty mentored projects.pdf](#)
- [David Claridge project - 2017-18.pdf](#)
- [Haily Chenoweth project - 2017-18.pdf](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

Assessment data continue to provide direction about changes and adjustments that need to be made for the Honors College to achieve its potential, many of which are listed and explained above. I believe the assessment plan as currently implemented is working very well and is just what is needed at this time. Some of the major changes involve our strategy for contract courses and mentoring experiences, changes in the Honors Adaptive Leadership training for both university and high school students and the hiring of a part-time faculty member. The assessment of the honors contract courses is a strength of the overall assessment plan. Faculty assessing their course outcomes and student learning experiences brings recognition to the absolute ways that the honors college curriculum is contributing to a highly rewarding experience for our students. The adaptive leadership theme and the requirements for high impact learning experiences will serve the student well in their careers of choice and in contributing to the common good as citizens and community leaders. Although the assessment practices may be rigorous and time-consuming for all involved, the effectiveness of the change strategies as outcomes of your assessment practices are genuine and absolutely contribute to a culture of continuous improvement of the student learning experience. Excellence in assessment is a culture in the Honors College! Great Job!

Academic Year 2017

The assessment work completed by the Honors College is outstanding! From the course embedded assessment practices using the assessment reporting survey tool to the student reflections on their community service and attendance at honors conferences, these practices are serving the college well. It is encouraging to see how the adaptive changes that are being implemented across the programming and learning experiences are being made based on the data that is being gathered and reported. The changes in the Mentors program has benefited students and faculty alike as the initial strategy was not as directed toward student/faculty academic interests. The contract courses growing in number and types of disciplines is encouraging as well. You make a nice assumption when stating that the Learning Community component just isn't developing as you would like and the student feedback from the honors floor in the residence halls shows that there is a lack of cohesive programming and academic themed learning experiences. It is also noted that the honors floor was a mix of honors and non-honors students which makes it impossible to create an individually themed learning community. Lessons learned from assessment always point us to those areas where we can positively impact learning experiences and where to prioritize our change strategy efforts. It may be fitting to continue to build the "learning community" concept in the residence halls and plan for a more comprehensive floor programming experience when the new residence hall opens in 2020. Extending the timeline out will provide more time for planning. In the meantime, because ESU is small and quaint, I would say that you have established a very valuable and integrated "learning community" with the students who are members of the "Honors College". It is appropriate to point out that the Honors students' accomplishments are continuously occurring and growing in number, and the ways in which you are comprehensively assessing these multi-faceted learning experiences is Outstanding! You are a model program for using assessment to identify the strengths and opportunities for your college. Keep up the great assessment work, it IS making an excellent impact on your students' learning experiences!

Academic Year 2016

The Honors College continues to grow and evolve simultaneously. It is acknowledged that the assessment plan has adapted as well, kudos to all involved. Although the Honors Program has been around for many years, the Honors College has taken an honors quality education to new heights. It was encouraging to read about the impact that the program is having on students in their reflective writing. Academic coursework is being assessed and reported by honors faculty, and the inclusiveness of the experience is awesome. The infusion of new courses and new high impact learning experiences has been the marquee highlights of the new college. Your assessments show that student learning is being measured relative to the learning experience and the impact of student engagement is being captured. The student learning experience has been expanded to include high school students being mentored by college students in Civic Leadership. The learning that is exhibited in assessment data shows that students are learning at multiple levels such as content knowledge, reflection, analysis, critical thinking and planning, and teaching. Providing students the opportunity to experience such a rich and rigorous educational environment is keenly tied to the University's mission for preparing students for lifelong learning, rewarding careers, and adaptive leadership. Keep up the great work!

Academic Year 2015

The assessment plan you have in place is multifaceted. It is comprehensive in the fact that it recognizes that the contributions of the Honors College to the student learning experience includes courses, activities, programs, mentoring, and experiential learning. You have designed many ways to measure these components and have both direct and indirect approaches. You have a good plan in place, and you also have a Honors College that is adapting due to its nature, so don't be concerned about changing and evolving your assessments to meet your needs. The purpose of the assessment plan is to know how things are going, what is working, and what isn't. Use findings to make decisions that perpetuate the college in a positive direction always keeping a pulse on the student experience. Use assessment as a tool to continuously improve and evolve the contributions that the Honors College brings to the educational experience. It's also alright to change the assessment plan to adapt to an ever changing environment. This is great first year data. One recommendation is to complete the Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps text box area and include comments about what you have learned this year and changes you intend to make as an outcome of your assessment findings.

Providing Department: Honors College

Responsible Roles: Brenda Wiggins (E10180053), Gary Wyatt (E10000946)

**UNIT REPORT****Intensive English Program Assessment Report 2018**

Generated: 10/25/18, 10:51 AM

International Education Intensive English Program Assessment Plan**Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

Our Assessment Committee continues to meet twice during the semester. Some changes were made in individual classes regarding assessment. The grammar classes had been using the on-line textbook support for exams, but we found that too many items were multiple choice or fill-in-the-blank. We added more items that required grammar production rather than recognition. Production of the structure is a better gauge of students' mastery. In writing classes we continue to focus on in-class writing rather than out-of-class assignments. This ensures that the students are doing their own writing and are able to work within a time restraint--something that will be required of them in academic classes. The instructors in the speaking classes are effectively using technology to enhance their classes. In the advanced speaking class students prepared individual videos that gave advice to future new international students. The students learned to edit their videos. Finally, they were compiled and presented as a capstone project. We continue to assess student performance as a class. We measure overall class performance against each stated student learning outcome. Performance is rated as "Developing," "Competent," or "Superior." The performance on the SLOs are analyzed to see which ones need more attention. The Assessment Committee works on strategies to improve performance in those areas of instruction.

AY 2017

As a staff, we have decided to continue with our assessment tools that we used in 2016. We will continue to use the rubrics that we have created. In terms of specific changes, we have discussed several changes regarding specific classes. In the beginning speaking and understanding, we are going to create a better instrument for assessing listening skills. We do not have a reliable test that is designed for listening students at the beginning level. At the intermediate level, we will introduce basic instruction with comparative and superlative forms. Rather than doing a specific unit, however, the instructors will incorporate them as they teach various verb tenses. Instructors will assess both skills at the same time. In intermediate speaking and understanding the instructors will spend more time assessing speaking. In writing, the intermediate students will do all of their graded writing in class to prevent students getting help from electronic devices. At the advanced level, the speaking and understanding classes will focus more on listening. Students currently do a lot of oral presentations, but we feel there is a shortage of listening activities. Instructors are going to have students do more note taking and more completions of rubrics as they listen to their classmates make oral presentations. As in intermediate writing, the advanced writers will do all of their graded writing in class.

AY 2016

At the end of the 2016 spring semester IEP faculty used the curriculum maps and rubrics tool in Campus Labs to assess individual classes. The basic guidelines for IEP instructors were as follows: For each class, determine where the majority of that class ranked for each language learning outcome on the curriculum map. Based on how the majority of the class accomplished the stated learning outcome, the class was ranked as Developing, Competent, or Advanced. The faculty used copies of the curriculum maps as a quick and easy checkoff method for their determination. After compiling the results, we met as a staff to analyze the data. At this time we did two things. First, we reviewed the learning outcomes for each class to determine if we wanted to reword existing outcomes or add new ones. Second, we analyzed the results of the spring semester's learning outcomes and deliberated how we might improve upon classroom performance. At this time we brainstormed and made determinations about how to maintain or improve the results that were reported. Before the start of the fall semester, we will meet again to reassess the curriculum maps and discuss what we can do to improve on the results reported from the spring semester. To meet requirements from our accrediting agency, CEA (Commission on English Language Program Accreditation), an assessment committee will meet twice each semester to review our curriculum Accreditation, an assessment committee will meet twice each semester to review our curriculum maps and assessment practices and how we might improve assessment and reporting of assessment in the future.

AY 2015

The Intensive English Program at Emporia State University is accredited by the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation

(CEA). The program aligns with the Standards set forth by the commission and assessment practices are implemented to insure compliance with CEA standards. During the spring semester, we formulated a plan to articulate the basic standards for each course at each level beginning, intermediate, and advanced. During the summer, we will work on how to evaluate those standards. Our basic plan is to measure the class for each standard we have chosen. We will determine where the majority of the class scores at each standard "developing," "competent," or "advanced." Our goal is to get 80% of the class to the "advanced" rating for each standard.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

The IEP staff continues to assess the overall competency of a class rather than tracking individual assessments. For each class, the instructors use a rubric with the student learning outcomes listed. Regarding the overall performance of the class, the instructors check one of three categories: Developing, Competent, or Superior. A designation of Developing indicates no evidence of skill for the SLO. Competent indicates minimal competency for the indicated SLO. Superior indicates mastery of the skill has been demonstrated by the majority of the students in the class. We continue to work as a staff on the best method for student assessment for the program.

AY 2017

Speaking and Understanding In the speaking and understanding classes, we began focusing on oral interviews in the first few days of the semester. In the past, large student numbers hindered us from doing oral interviews as part of the placement procedure. We focused primarily on listening. However, we decided that an early oral interview would be helpful, especially to target students early in the semester who might benefit with some one-on-one oral practice in our tutoring lab.

Writing Assessments in writing classes focused primarily on composition topics for program-wide assessments: placement writing exam, diagnostic writing exam, and final writing exam. For the placement and diagnostic exams, we tried to avoid topics with complex rhetorical modes. Instead, we focused on wording topics carefully so that the topics dealt mainly with enumeration or narrative and topics that could be understood by writers at all skill levels. **Reading** The reading classes continue to pose a problem of finding ways to assess students' reading skills with authentic materials. By the end of the semester, the reader will have been limited to just a few topics from the textbook. To this end, we have collected a wide variety of reading passages that we can draw from. This gives us a better idea of whether the student has mastered the skills that were covered in class.

Our main challenge in the grammar classes concerns finding a good balance of assessment materials. Most of the current textbooks come with a test bank that instructors can load into the computer. Unfortunately, most of the questions on these exams are based on recognition rather than production. Most of the questions from the test bank are multiple choice.

AY 2016

In order to strengthen our assessment procedures and to comply with our accreditation agency, CEA, we established an assessment committee that meets twice each semester--at the beginning and at the end. As a committee, we decided to use our rubric templates in the spring to assess our classes. Each class was evaluated in terms of overall success. How did the majority of the class do in meeting the standards for each learning outcome? Faculty used a check-off system and rated the class as Developing, Competent, or Superior. Our goal was to have the majority of the class at the Superior level. If that did not happen, the committee strategized about improving class performance. We will continue to evaluate both the learning outcomes listed and the overall proficiency of each class.

AY 2015

As next year develops we will initiate the use of the rubrics developed to measure standards as matching with the CEA accreditation requirements.

Attached Files

[CEA Standards for Accreditation - IEP Program 2015](#)

Program Name : Reading and Speaking Programs

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

In classes that teach reading, we find that students can often find the answer to a question from a reading, but the answer provided is usually

straight from the text being read. We are implementing a new strategy that will combine assessments of both reading and speaking skills. In both intermediate and advanced reading classes, when a student is asked to provide an answer from a written text, the student will try and articulate a response using his/her own words rather than relying on the text and just repeating words directly from the text. This will integrate both reading and speaking skills. The student will employ the skill of scanning to find the answer in the text. The student will use the context to help clarify meaning. Finally, the student will think about what the text says and try to put the answer into different words. Even with just a slight variation from the text, the student is employing a form of paraphrasing which is a high-level skill. We continue to use our rubrics to gauge the success of classes on our student learning outcomes. Our assessment committee continues to discuss what student learning outcomes to focus on. Current rubrics evidence is found in the file library.

AY 2017

In summary of Reading assessments we seek to determine if students can demonstrate proficiency from a reading text with which they are not familiar? We continue to try and incorporate critical reading skills, but realize as second-language learners that students often lack the vocabulary sophistication to adequately express themselves with this higher level concept. Our rubric assessment guide has proven to be valuable in determining if the reading skills are being learned as expected.

With respect to the Speaking program, instructors doing the oral interviews have a master list of speaking prompts that they can draw from. Each student is rated on answers to five questions. Instructors use a rubric to rate the students on their overall performance. In terms of listening, we have been relying heavily on Randall's ESL Listening Lab via the internet. It provides short graded conversations at three levels: Easy, Medium, and Difficult, so they can be used at all three levels of our program. The conversations are followed with 5 multiple choice questions. They provide instructors with a quick assessment tool that can be done in the classroom. The rubrics evidence files are located in the file library.

AY 2016

The rubrics were completed in the summer of 2015 and the curriculum map was completed this past 2016 academic year. Over the course of the year, faculty engaged in employing a rubric to assess the reading and speaking courses being taught. The data and findings from the one-year assessment cycle serve as a baseline for comparison data for the 2017 academic year and subsequent years. As mentioned, the faculty committee has reviewed student performance results and are planning strategies to improve student learning. Using the data from the first year, individual faculty are making course level and assignment level changes, but strategies at the program levels will not be determined until multiple iterations of data can inform decisions. Rubrics results are shown in the evidence files for beginning, intermediate, and advanced courses.

Attached Files

- [IE-002-Intermediate-Speaking--Understanding-2017](#)
- [IE-004-Intermediate-Reading-2017](#)
- [IE-006-Advanced-Speaking--Understanding-2017](#)
- [IE-008-Advanced-Reading-2017](#)
- [IE-012-Beginning-Speaking--Understanding-2017](#)
- [IE-014-Beginning-Reading-2017](#)
- [LAS-IE-ENGLISH SPEAKING-FA15](#)
- [LAS-IE-ENGLISH READING-FA15](#)
- [IE-002-Intermediate-Speaking--Understanding](#)
- [IE-004-Intermediate-Reading](#)
- [IE-006-Advanced-Speaking--Understanding](#)
- [IE-008-Advanced-Reading](#)
- [IE-012-Beginning-Speaking--Understanding](#)
- [IE-014-Beginning-Reading](#)
- [IE-002-Intermediate-Speaking--Understanding-2018.pdf](#)
- [IE-004-Intermediate-Reading-2018.pdf](#)
- [IE-006-Advanced-Speaking--Understanding-2018.pdf](#)
- [IE-008-Advanced-Reading-2018.pdf](#)

Program Name: Grammar and Writing Programs

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

Our assessment committee looked at student learning outcomes in writing and grammar and looked at the specific problem of the disconnect

between grammar class learning and writing class production. We wanted to see how we could see more evidence of writers using the grammar concepts that students had learned in the grammar class. We want to see more writing in the grammar classes as part of the assessment tool. Instead of having students recognize the grammar by filling in a blank or choosing from multiple answers, we have the students use the structure by writing sentences or short responses that require the grammar concept. Our exams are focusing more and more on production. Results show that students are meeting student learning outcomes at a greater rate as indicated in our reporting in the file library.

AY 2017

For the grammar component, as a staff, we have agreed on the need to supplement book provided tests with questions that deal with production. Students should be able to demonstrate that they can produce the grammar concept that has been covered in class. Grammar instructors try to work up test elements that require students to write sentences that demonstrate their mastery of the targeted grammar concept. Another assessment tool that has been effective is to have students present an oral activity such as a skit or narrative that requires the use of the grammar element in question.

For the writing final exam essay, we expanded topic choices to include rhetorical modes that the students had studied during the semester. Overall, we felt that we were now providing topics that were more suited to students' skills at different stages of assessment. Assessment findings (2017 rubrics scores in the file library) showed that most of the students are progressing as they should. The results of the rubrics scores for 2017 are shown in the file library.

AY 2016

Similar to the reading and speaking program, the rubrics and curriculum maps were used to apply assessment techniques and scoring student work determined the student success levels across beginning, intermediate, and advanced level courses. The data will be used to inform program level decisions when data accumulated over multiple semesters can be compared. The results did show that the majority of students are proceeding through the program successfully. It is noted that depending on the given characteristics of the students entering the program, different weaknesses and needs emerge. We are beginning the conversations about how we can bring a more in-depth approach to understanding the data as it applies to different learner groups. This is true based on where the students are originally from (native country), and also the language which is considered native. It is always a challenge to adapt to these incoming student populations to ensure that learning is occurring as it should to prepare them for success in a major program of study. Rubrics evidence files are shown in the file library.

Attached Files

- [IE-001-Intermediate-Structure-2017](#)
- [IE-003-Intermediate-Writing-2017](#)
- [IE-005-Advanced-Structure-2017](#)
- [IE-009-Advanced-Writing-2017](#)
- [IE-011-Beginning-Structure-2017](#)
- [IE-013-Beginning-Writing-2017](#)
- [LAS-IE-ENGLISH WRITING-FA15](#)
- [LAS-IE-ENGLISH GRAMMAR-FA15](#)
- [IE-001-Intermediate-Structure](#)
- [IE-003-Intermediate-Writing](#)
- [IE-005-Advanced-Structure](#)
- [IE-009-Advanced-Writing](#)
- [IE-011-Beginning-Structure](#)
- [IE-013-Beginning-Writing](#)
- [IE-001-Intermediate-Structure-2018.pdf](#)
- [IE-003-Intermediate-Writing-2018.pdf](#)
- [IE-005-Advanced-Structure-2018.pdf](#)
- [IE-009-Advanced-Writing-2018.pdf](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

AY 2018

The progress being made in changing the performance measures to incorporate higher order learning skills is a very nice change to the existing pedagogy and curriculum. Incorporating technology into the learning experience advances students' abilities to use technology as a

learning tool and can be used as students advance to study in their major discipline, as well. The integration of the learning experiences such as combining the learning of grammar with the product of writing, and the understanding of reading with the product of explaining through speaking should produce higher levels of learning competencies in all areas. Changing the measuring instruments to include more original works instead of identification and selection in tests will also positively improve the student learning experience and competencies. It will be important to have faculty dialogue about the potential impact of the rubric scoring on the newer mechanisms for measuring student learning. If necessary, you may need to have a rubric norming session where a few faculty look at common assignments and then score them to the rubrics, to verify that faculty are interpreting student performance in similar ways. I say this because the faculty are used to scoring on the rubrics with previous assignments and may not make universal adjustments to the new assignment types. It may be worthy of a conversation. If you have questions about this rubric norming concept, please reach out to me. The faculty working together to assess the students' learning and collaborating to improve the student learning experience is a strength of the program. Overall, your faculty dedicate their efforts to continuously improving the student learning experience and incorporate key strategic changes on an annual basis. This is a best practice. Maintaining these concerted assessment efforts among the faculty is encouraged, as there are many positive benefits for our students educational experiences. Thank you for all you do!

AY 2017

The faculty of the IE Program have continued to work together to make changes across the curriculum at all of the levels of learning for the key content areas of the program including Reading, Speaking, Grammar, and Writing. In reviewing the results of the rubrics scores and progress for this past 2017 academic year, most students are learning at levels which are preparing them to matriculate into a university level curriculum. You have expanded your beginning of the year placement evaluations and this appears to be a key information piece in determining where some students are struggling with the curriculum and possibly identifying where the resource materials being used for instruction are falling short. You have made some nice changes based on this information and having faculty engage in dialogue to improve the student learning experience is a key assessment strategy that is always encouraged. As with having new students entering into the IE program every year, you will have year-to-year fluctuations in knowledge and skill sets based on the country of origin and whether English is a second, third, or fourth language. The faculty have a quality system in place to identify the nuances of these first-time students and it is encouraging to see that curricular changes are being made annually to adjust to these changing student demographics. You will want to begin preparations for the program reaccreditation in the upcoming year. Keep up the good work and continue to engage faculty in dialogue relating to student learning improvement strategies. Nice Job!

AY 2016

The Intensive English Program has made good progress with designing the assessment infrastructure to inform its program. The curriculum maps and rubrics have served to collect a years worth of student learning performances and are setting a baseline to inform curricular and pedagogical decisions. A suggestion for next year is to include the beginning of term placement evaluations. These data can serve to inform curriculum decisions and improve the ability to make adaptations to serve student needs prior to the beginning of classes (keeping faculty abreast of anticipated challenges). This information can also be used to show the progress students have made from the time they begin the program until they complete it. You can also look at term-to-term progress, as well. This information can be very valuable for faculty as it shows the areas where students are excelling in their learning, while also identifying areas of need. This type of data will also help identify the differences among learner groups that has served as challenges in the past. This is good assessment work, continue to engage your faculty in conversations about how student learning can be maximized, this is key to improving student success across all three learning levels.

AY 2015

The alignment with the assessment plan with the CEA specialized accreditation standards is a best practice. Student successes on these standards measured by rubrics will enable you to look at student performances (formative assessments) on a term by term basis and will also allow for some trend information (summative assessments) to also drive your decision-making, curriculum changes, and pedagogical strategies. Although this assessment program is newly developed, the set up is solid and should serve you well in the future. Continue emphasis on the curriculum mapping piece where you define and refine student learning outcomes at the course level, then align the courses with the program student learning outcomes. You have this in place already, but the refinement will occur as you adjust to external accreditation requirements. Also, let the findings from your assessments drive your future directions. Pick those areas where the students are having struggles or not quite learning as the faculty would like. Some of the challenges the IEP faces may be linked to the constant changing of the student population you serve. Adapting to these challenges will be served well by the assessment plan. You might want to look at the feedback loops the students have to share their thoughts. Learning about how students conceptualize their learning can help identify learning strategies which are strengths for them. This may help in the short term adaptations and strategies. In addition, the rubrics results should provide some direction in next steps as well. Be sure to include them in next year's report.

Providing Department: International Education - Intensive English Program

UNIT REPORT

Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:35 AM

**Office of Institutional Effectiveness****Assessment Planning and Reporting:****Academic Year 2018**

The 2018 academic year was highly challenging and rewarding. We were fully engaged in preparing for the Assurance Review and Comprehensive Evaluation visit by the Higher Learning Commission which is scheduled for October 29-30, 2018. These preparations included creating a handbook, planning the meetings and delegating the work, and providing key strategic directives for the HLC Leadership Team throughout the year. The Team was introduced to the new "argument style" writing techniques through a day-long workshop in the summer of 2017. The workshop included identifying key words in the criterion and core-components, writing assurance statements, and identifying key evidence documents to support the assurance argument. Going into the new 2019 academic year on July 1, 2018, the assurance argument had been revised, evidence documents had been uploaded into the assurance system, and the linking of evidence documents and editing of the assurance argument was ongoing. Completion date for locking the argument was scheduled for the first part of September, well ahead of the October 1, lock date deadline.

The beginning of the fall semester included the launch of the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting tool. The Student Learning Assessment Council in collaboration with the Assistant Provost had been tweaking the new tool during the summer, and it was shown to the Provost's Council for final approval. This tool was designed for faculty to report their course-embedded assessments for measuring the student learning outcomes in their assigned courses. The tool was built to align with the new university policy supporting faculty assessment of student learning outcomes. This policy was the result of the Faculty Senate Bill FSB-16011 stating that assessment of student learning is a basic faculty responsibility. It was signed into policy by President Garrett on May of 2017. This assessment reporting tool was introduced by the SLAC to the faculty and it was made available through a Canvas course named "Report Assessment". This course provided instruction and a tutorial to prepare faculty to submit their assessment reports. In addition, the link to the reporting tool was placed on the Faculty/Advising Tab in the BuzzIn secure portal. Faculty participation in the assessment of student learning was captured using the reporting tool and a participation report is uploaded in the file library.

The commitment by the Assistant Provost to provide leadership and mentoring for the assessment of the General Education program and the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT) resulted in continued progress on the overall assessment practices, changes to operations and policy for general education faculty (via the General Education Council), and increased faculty participation in the assessment of student learning for their assigned courses.

The redesign and updating of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness website was a key priority for the Assistant Provost. The website was designed in alignment with creating a transparent environment where accreditation, assessment, and institutional research operations communicate the progress and practices of the institution. The website contains evidence of ongoing program review and assessment practices at the school/college, department, program, and course levels. Annual reports for strategic planning and assessment are uploaded to the site for stakeholders and interest parties to review. The program learning objectives for all academic programs are listed and linked by department and school/college affiliation. The Data Book is the common set of metrics reported annually with multiple year trend data related to the institution's characteristics and in comparison to other Kansas Regents institutions. Additional information is provided through survey results for the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Career Services Destination Survey, and the Senior Survey. Comprehensively, these multiple metrics and information points provide information related to the institution's effectiveness and continuous monitoring and reporting of key performance metrics.

One of the key areas of improvement occurred by providing faculty professional development opportunities to learn about assessment practices and to coordinate assessment efforts at the course and program levels. The canvas course continues to evolve with more materials and direction in faculty and staff engaging in quality assessment practices. The newest ADA legislation has been challenging in the fact that all materials must be compliant and this is an additional layer of complexity. New materials must comply, however going back through all of the documentation, presentations, and video's to ensure that accommodations are available has been a challenge on existing resources.

A sharepoint site names Assessment Resources was developed with the assistance of the Information Technology department where all of the assessment support materials are available for faculty and staff to access. This site provides a secure portal where faculty and staff have

open access to all assessment resources and supporting materials by using their ESU sign-on credentials, meanwhile making the information password protected. This site includes documents such as assessment plan and syllabus templates, workshop materials and workbooks, in addition to presentations and video's supporting institution-wide assessment practices.

Academic Year 2017

The main goals for this academic year were to coordinate and facilitate efforts to respond to the HLC directives regarding general education assessment, confirm that the processes for accountability for the faculty qualifications folder in skybox were followed across the institution, to continue to build the assessment capacity for the institution (curricular and co-curricular), and to integrate the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan into the reporting structure for The Adaptive University strategic plan.

It was critical to provide leadership in navigating the changes that needed to occur in the assessment of the general education program and to integrate assessment at the goal level and to develop an assessment planning cycle that provided the structure for continuous quality improvements in student learning, meanwhile providing the opportunity to continuously evolve the program. The strategies employed to implement this assessment process was to administratively plan for resource allocation, collaboration across multiple departments, and align the assessment strategies for a select group of faculty who were recruited to do specialized assessment in analyzing the efficacy of the general education program at the goal level. Thus providing leadership for two groups, the General Education Assessment Steering Committee (GEAS) made up of the Provost, Dean of Liberal Arts & Science, Associate Dean of Liberal Arts & Sciences/Director of General Education, and the Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness, and the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT). The GEAT is a group of faculty members that matriculates on an annual basis and is recruited specifically to perform specialized general education assessment projects.

The Assistant Provost also serves in a co-leader role for the Higher Learning Commission Leadership Team which is the entity that coordinates the HLC Assurance Review process that is currently ongoing with a scheduled review and site visit in October of 2018.

Related to academic program assessment, those programs that are not under assessment directives by specialized accreditation entities were introduced to an assessment plan that incorporates a 5-year cycle of assessment where refreshing curriculum maps occurs as a part of the process, students are assessed at the end of the program's learning experience on an annual basis and during years two through four of the cycle all courses in the curriculum are assessed at least once to confirm effectiveness of student learning and to identify potential curricular changes. In the last year of the assessment cycle an executive summary serves to close the loop where an analysis of assessment findings are summarized along with directed change strategies for the curriculum and an opportunity to refresh the curriculum maps leading into the next 5-year cycle. The purpose of this cycle is to align with program review indicators and position the programs to continuously assess and improve the student learning experience, meanwhile ensuring the currency of the curriculum.

Professional development opportunities included a new set of workshops designed to expand assessment knowledge, techniques, and capacity for measuring and improving student learning. The topics of these workshops were Course Embedded Assessment, Using Rubrics to Measure Student Learning, and Writing and Measuring Student Learning Outcomes. In addition to the workshops a professional development series online course was developed to provide faculty and staff an assessment learning platform that is asynchronous, self-paced, and available on demand. This course has 10 different topic modules and will be available in the Fall of 2017. Overall, there were many leadership opportunities and challenges as the need to expand institutional effectiveness strategies, assessment capacity, and continuous reporting of institutional research metrics and reports. A very challenging year, yet a high impact effect on moving the institution forward in many ways.

Academic Year 2016

This academic year has been dedicated to confirming infrastructure by aligning the new strategic plan "The Adaptive University" with institution-wide goals, objectives, and strategies. The processes for measuring and reporting the accomplishments of the plan were implemented using the Campus Labs - Compliance Assist Module. Institution-wide, we have enacted policy, implemented processes, and confirmed record-keeping for ensuring that the Higher Learning Commission's Faculty Qualifications requirements are met. In addition, we confirmed that all courses contain student learning outcomes and that faculty vitae are up to date with term-to-term course assignments included. Curriculum maps were updated for all programs in all colleges/schools and a repository was been designed to contain electronic evidence of all of these documents. Vitae, syllabi, and curriculum maps are all stored in the skybox secure area.

The workflow in the office has transitioned to support the completion and oversight of the accuracy of the Faculty Qualifications Skybox site and reporting on strategic planning accomplishments. Initially, this new process required many hours of training and consultation with leaders and support staff. These supporting resources continue to evolve and include follow up training and updating system users and tweaking the set-up in compliance assist to accommodate change. In addition to ensuring that all faculty submitted vitae and syllabi for their assigned courses, department chairs were charged with updating curriculum maps for all major programs. These curriculum maps are serving as the infrastructure to drive assessment plans and to ensure that all majors have current curricula. It is paramount to the success of

the institution to maintain and evolve all programs to match the needs of stakeholders and the demands of the external environment.

Research dedicated to informing institutional effectiveness strategies included a six-year trend analysis of transfer credits by first-time freshman cohorts from 2010 through 2015. This study informs academic planning and budgeting at multiple operational levels. The data show that over the trend, students have continued to transfer in high numbers of credit hours (average of 14) and more students are doing so (45%).

Workshops were held to build capacity for faculty in implementing assessment practices for their general education courses. These workshops provide hands on instruction in curriculum mapping and assessment. These workshops are dedicated to assisting faculty in assessment planning, implementation, and reporting.

A significant amount of work was done in assessing the institutional processes for assessment of student learning in general education. This was a part of HLC follow-up report compliance that includes an improved general education assessment plan that incorporates cyclical and ongoing assessment planning and implementation.

Finally, providing leadership for the General Education Assessment Team (GEAT) has been a fulfilling endeavor as the vision for assessment of the program is being actualized. Although this process began over three years ago the progress we have made in the 2016 academic year is very encouraging.

Academic Year 2015

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) has a staff of three, an Assistant Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, a Research Analyst, and a Senior Administrative Assistant. During the 2015 Academic Year, the OIRA focused efforts on internal and external reporting, creating the resource room, linking the evidence documents and assisting in document editing for the Higher Learning Commission Self-Study (November) and on-site visit (March), assessing the strategies currently being used for institution-wide assessment (including curricular, co-curricular, and general education programs), and building the Compliance Assist (Campus Labs) interface for capturing of data and reporting for *"The Adaptive University"*, strategic plan.

Assessment efforts included compiling program review indicators for each academic department and providing consulting services to facilitate program level curriculum mapping and review of program currency. These efforts are ongoing into the 2016 academic year.

In addition to mandated external reporting and internal decision-making reporting, the Kansas Legislature visited the regents institutions in a campus "Bus Tour" and prior to the tour submitted a list of 54 questions asking for data and information to inform the tour participants above and beyond annually reported data. The OIRA worked collaboratively with the Business Office, Financial Aid, and Registration personnel to compile the report as summoned. Building the resource room for the self-study included compiling, organizing and archiving over 2000 evidence files with an additional 1500+ files for course syllabi and faculty vitae. Editing the self-study document, linking evidence documents to factual statements, and integrating the self-study into the final template was extensive and required a substantial time commitment from the Assistant Provost (AP).

The Student Learning Assessment Council began its tenure in August 2014, as this council replaced the Teaching and Learning Assessment Committee. This transition included a complete revision of the council's constitutional charge and the membership structure. The council adapted from a small advisory group to that of a working group consisting of more than 25 members whose appointment is determined by position held consisting of faculty and administrative appointments. This group worked throughout the year on evaluating the existing Program Assessment of Student Learning reporting structure and the affiliated meta assessment rubric. The group also engaged in transitioning from reporting in a paper document format to an electronic report submission and attachment of affiliated assessment evidence documents. The development of the Student Learning Improvement Plan in the Campus Labs Compliance Assist module was completed by the AP and training workshops were held throughout the spring term. In addition to the assessment interface, the AP designed and built the interface to share and report strategic planning along with the mechanisms to capture data for quarterly and annual reporting of the plans performance indicators. These updates are also coordinated with updates to the KBOR Foresight 2020 Strategic Plan and the KBOR Performance Indicator Reports.

The OIRA also has oversight and administrates the College Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) competency testing. This includes testing for graduation competency requirements and program admission competency requirements for students in the Teacher Education program. These test administrations are held on the ESU main campus and also at the ESU-Kansas City site. The office also coordinates the Millers Analogies Test for those securing admittance into graduate programs.

General Education Program assessment was one of the main focuses for this past year as implementing strategies for training faculty in general education assessments, and insuring that the program is continuously assessing various aspects of the program in an intentional cyclical process. The curriculum mapping of all general education courses is nearing completion and faculty participating in course embedded assessments is being aided by workshops held by the AP. Coordination of General Education assessments has been incorporated into the annual assessment plan for those core skills addressed in General Education Goal 1 for written and oral communication, analytical reasoning, and critical thinking. Student works from courses emphasizing these core skills are being sampled and scored using the AAC&U

Value Rubrics by small groups of discipline specific faculty and graduate teaching assistants who instruct courses such as Composition I and II.

Integral to measuring institutional effectiveness, the OIRA engages in analysis and reporting of various metrics deemed important to institution-wide success. These reports analyze student success, compare ESU to peers and aspirational peers, track retention and completion metrics, and inform decision-making at all levels of operations. Ad-Hoc requests for data and analyses are common as individuals are validating information that is necessary for decision-making at the administrative levels. These ad-hoc reports are related to topics such as credit hour production, faculty salaries, program specific retention, and range from simple one page reports to multiple spreadsheet analyses. Some of the supporting evidence documents are shared in the attached files.

Overall, the OIRA had a very productive year and has made significant contributions to dedicating both Institutional Research and Assessment resources toward enhancing university strategic planning implementation and mission fulfillment.

Attached Files

- [6-Term 201250-201510 Tuition Revenue Analysis 6-26-15](#)
- [Analysis of PASL Survey as of 8-20-2014](#)
- [Analysis of Student Success - Data to Inform Success Strategies edv](#)
- [Cumulative List of Student Learning Outcomes as of Fall 2014](#)
- [ESU Narrative 7-17-2015 ACTUAL SUBMISSION](#)
- [ESU form 7-17-2015 ACTUAL SUBMISSION](#)
- [Graduate Studies-Distance Education - Consultation 11-14-2013](#)
- [Hands on Workshop on how to Navigate Compliance Assist 12-8-14](#)
- [High Impact Practices - Consultation - Transformation to Pathways](#)
- [Information Technologies - Initial Consultation 11-14-2013](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 2-23-2016](#)
- [A Six-Year Trend Analysis of Transfer Credits FT Freshman 2010-15](#)
- [Analysis of Student Success - Data to Inform Success Strategies 8-19-2014](#)
- [Faculty Qualifications and UPM Information 8-24-15 - JK](#)
- [Strategic Plan Report - July 2016 Completion of Year 1](#)
- [Strategic Planning Highlights Update November 16 - Pres Vietti](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 2-23-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 3-22-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 4-12-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 06-15-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 08-18-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 09-15-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 10-20-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 12-15-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 2-23-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 3-22-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 4-12-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 4-12-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 06-15-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 08-18-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 09-15-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 10-20-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 12-15-2015](#)
- [SLAC Meeting Dates for AY 2016](#)
- [Curriculum Mapping Template with Example](#)
- [Guidelines for Developing and Communicating Course Level SLOs](#)
- [SLAC Depart Assessment Teams as of 6-1-2016](#)
- [Letter Recommendation to Student Learning Assessment Council April 2017](#)
- [Timeline for FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS AND ASSESSMENT PLAN Updates](#)
- [Review of Campus Committees Student Learning Assessment Council 1-23-17](#)
- [GAP Analysis-Preparing for the HLC Assurance Review for Fall 2018](#)
- [Assessment Knowledge Share Schedule for AY 2017](#)

- [HLC Statement on the expectations for guidelines for stating SLO's](#)
- [SLAC meeting Schedule for Spring 2017 Term](#)
- [Student Learning Assessment Council 2017](#)
- [Student Affairs Learning Assessment - Career Services 2017](#)
- [Student Affairs Learning Assessment - Financial Aid 2017](#)
- [Integrated Learning - Analysis of Past - Plan for Future](#)
- [KBOR Strategic Goal One Annual Update 10-12-15](#)
- [KBOR Strategic Goal Three Annual Update 10-12-15](#)
- [KBOR Strategic Goal Two Annual Update 10-12-15](#)
- [LA&S-GEN-ED -Consultation Pathways - 11-14-2013](#)
- [Libraries and Archives - Transformation to Pathways 01-28-14](#)
- [Memorandum on Assurance System Training 9-1-2015](#)
- [Meta Rubric for Assessment Best Practices Evaluation 4-3-15](#)
- [PV Salary Data - IPEDS_KBOR Peers updated as of 6-16-15](#)
- [Retention Efforts and Student Success Initiatives 11-6-2013](#)
- [School of Business - Transformation to Pathways - 11-6-2013](#)
- [SLAC Depart Assessment Teams 2-13-2015](#)
- [SLAC Meeting Workshop - Building Rubric in Baseline and Template](#)
- [SLIM - Transformation to Pathways - 11-14-2013](#)
- [Student Affairs Division - Transformation to Pathways - 11-6-2013](#)
- [Student Learning Assessment Council - Official for AY 2015](#)
- [SWOT Analysis for the PASL Assessment Reporting Tool](#)
- [The Teachers College Transformation to Pathways - 11-6-2013](#)
- [The Teachers College - Transformation to Pathways - Chairs Meeting](#)
- [Training for Assessment Faculty in the Use of Compliance Assist Fall 2015](#)
- [Training for Assessment Faculty Compliance Assist January 2015](#)
- [Training for Strategic Planning Reporting - Foundation 5-20-2015](#)
- [Training for Strategic Planning Reporting - Access Site - 5-20-2015](#)
- [Training for Strategic Planning Reporting - Provost's Council - 9-4-2015](#)
- [Training for Strategic Planning Reporting - Student Affairs Division 8-27-15](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 01-26-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 02-16-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 03-16-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 04-20-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 05-11-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 08-20-2014](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 09-15-2014](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 10-13-2014](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 12-08-2014](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 01-26-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 02-16-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 03-16-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 04-20-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 05-11-2015](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 08-20-2014](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 09-15-2014](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 10-13-2014](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 12-08-2014](#)
- [Assessment Champions write up for 2016 Awards](#)
- [Percentage of Graduates Time to Graduation 2-25-2016](#)
- [PV Salary Data - IPEDS_KBOR Peers updated as of 6-16-15](#)
- [6-Term 201250-201510 Tuition Revenue Analysis pdf 6-26-15a](#)
- [Trend Data 3-Year Average Cost of FTE and SCH Delivery 3-2-2016](#)
- [KBOR Peer Comparison Metrics Spring 2016](#)
- [Executive Dashboard Final for June 2016](#)
- [ESU Interim Report HLC Response on 3-14-2016](#)

- [📄 Syllabus Policy in UPM](#)
- [📄 Faculty Qualifications Folder Access and Assigned Roles 10-01-2015](#)
- [📄 Syllabi Naming Rules and Evidence Repository as of 8-28-2015](#)
- [📄 FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS Guidelines and Procedures 8-28-2015](#)
- [📄 Assessment of the Institutional Processes for Gen-Ed SP 2016](#)
- [📄 HLC Evidence Document Report - Assessment - Gen Ed Program Plan](#)
- [📄 Memorandum HLC Directives for Assessing Gen Ed 3-10-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Charge Spring 2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 4-8-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 4-22-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 4-29-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 5-13-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 5-25-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 6-10-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 7-20-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 3-9-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 4-8-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 4-22-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 4-29-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 5-13-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 5-25-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 6-10-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 7-20-2016](#)
- [📄 Gen Ed Assessment Meeting Agenda 07-07-2016](#)
- [📄 General Education Assessment Committee and Coor Efforts 5-9-2016](#)
- [📄 General Education Assessment Planning Cycles Summer 2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Agenda 8-5-2016](#)
- [📄 GEAS Committee Minutes 8-5-2016](#)
- [📄 Student Affairs Learning Assessment - Registration 2017](#)
- [📄 LAS SOCIOLOGY Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 SCHOOL OF BUSINESS Department Assessment Roles - Updated](#)
- [📄 SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFO Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 TTC ELEMENTARY EC SE Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 TTC HPER Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 TTC IDT Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 TTC PSYCHOLOGY Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 TTC SCH_LEAD Department Assessment Roles - revised May, 2017](#)
- [📄 TTC SCHOOL COUNSELING Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS ART Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS COMMUNICATION THEATRE Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS ENGLISH, ML, JOURNALISM Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS MATHEMATICS ECONOMICS Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS MUSIC Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS NURSING Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS PHYSICAL SCIENCES Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 LAS SOCIAL SCIENCES Department Assessment Roles](#)
- [📄 Assessment Cycle Examples Using Curriculum Maps Submitted 1-23-2017](#)
- [📄 English BA Curriculum Map Excel May 2016 with Rubrics](#)
- [📄 Designing a Program Level Assessment Cycle](#)
- [📄 Workshop for Entering 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle in Compliance Assist](#)
- [📄 Assessment Champions write up for 2017 Awards](#)
- [📄 Student Affairs Assessment Using the Compliance Assist Module Workshop Pres](#)
- [📄 Designing and Using Rubrics to Measure Student Learning Handbook](#)
- [📄 Designing and Using Rubrics to Measure Student Learning Presentation](#)

- [Assessing General Education Workshop PP Spring 2016](#)
- [Assessing General Education Workshop Spring 2016 - Workbook and Checklist](#)
- [3-Simple Steps for Entering Your General Education Course - PP](#)
- [Course Embedded Assessment Workshop Spring 2017 Workbook Checklist](#)
- [Planning and Implementing Course Embedded Assessment Workshop Spring 2017](#)
- [Workbook for Writing Meaningful and Measurable Student Learning Outcomes](#)
- [Writing Meaningful and Measurable Student Learning Outcomes](#)
- [Student Affairs Assessment Using the Compliance Assist Module Workshop 2-15-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 2-6-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 4-17-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 4-26-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 5-3-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 8-5-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Agenda 12-2-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 2-6-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 4-17-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 4-26-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 5-3-2017](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 8-5-2016](#)
- [GEAS Committee Minutes 12-2-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 1-24-2017](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 2-14-2017](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 5-9-2017](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 7-26-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 8-23-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 9-27-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 10-25-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 11-29-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 1-24-2017](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 2-14-2017](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 5-9-2017](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 7-26-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 8-23-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 9-27-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 10-25-2016](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 11-29-2016](#)
- [Gen Ed Assessment Team Provost File July 2016](#)
- [Gen Ed Assessment Process Review Provost File July 2016](#)
- [Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting Results](#)
- [Analysis of Course Embedded Assessment Practices Academic Year 2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 1-26-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 2-23-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 3-30-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 5-25-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 8-25-2017.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 10-27-2017.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Agenda 12-1-2017.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 1-26-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 3-30-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 2-23-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 5-25-2018.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 8-25-2017.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 10-27-2017.pdf](#)
- [SLAC - Minutes 12-1-2017.pdf](#)
- [GEAT Meeting Agenda 3-16-2018x.pdf](#)
- [GEAT Meeting Agenda 1-12-2018.pdf](#)

- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 4-20-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 3-2-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-1-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-15-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 10-11-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 8-30-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 9-13-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 10-20-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 11-3-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 3-2-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 1-12-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 3-16-2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-13-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-1-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 4-20-2018x.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 8-30-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Agenda 12-6-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 10-11-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 10-20-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 11-3-2017x.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 12-6-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAT Meeting Minutes 9-15-2017.pdf](#)
- [📄 GEAS Combined Meeting Documents 2-6-17 to 1-24-18.pdf](#)
- [📄 Basic Assessment Essentials Combined Power Point and Introduction Workbook.pdf](#)

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Providing Department: Institutional Effectiveness

Responsible Roles:

Assessment Report School of Business 2018

Generated: 10/10/18, 1:21 PM



School of Business Assessment Plan

Describe Annual Assessment Plans:

AY 2018

The School of Business is working on a detailed plan to ensure that the data collection is routine and systematically analyzed and shared with faculty. Conversations have begun to explore how course embedded measures can be developed and used. Ideally, the measures developed will be used in different sections of the same course. However, issues of academic freedom may preclude a consistent measure being used across multiple sections. The School of Business is also reviewing the current learning goals of all programs with the intent to simplify each goal by only including one major area of learning per goal. For example, the BSB Learning Goal #1 includes "basic knowledge and "communication". Separation of these two different, but important goals is necessary to make assessment efforts cleaner in terms of collecting and reporting data. The School of Business is also reviewing current measurement instruments (assignments/test questions) and rubrics.

AY 2017

The School of Business will submit a required maintenance report in December 2016 to AACSB-International for their Maintenance of Accreditation visit scheduled for February 26-28, 2017. The findings and recommendations of the visiting team will guide future assessment plans and activities related to AACSB accreditation. In the meantime, all programs within the School of Business continue to be mapped to meet KSDE assessment requirements.

AY 2016

The School of Business has been engaged in preparing for the AACSB-International Maintenance of Accreditation visit scheduled for February 26-28, 2017. In the meantime, the required maintenance report is due for submission December 2016. The faculty have been working on curricular mapping for all programs in the school and this has included curricular updates and assessments used in the AACSB endeavors. Priorities were dedicated to ensuring that the assessment activities were concluded in regards to the AACSB requirements.

AY 2015

During the 2015 Academic Year, the School of Business has been actively engaged in The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB International) reaccreditation process. This process including the 2016 report submission and site visit includes integrated assessment processes aligned with AACSB requirements. The School of Business also adhere's to the Kansas Department of Education standards and reporting requirements for both its Bachelor and Master of Business degrees in Education. Supporting student learning improvements and aligning learning outcomes with the KSDE and the AACSB provide the assessment infrastructure for the school.

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

During the spring 2018 semester the School of Business received its final approval of its re-accreditation fro AACSB-International. The school started working on several areas which were highlighted as areas of improvement by the accreditation report. One such area is in so called "closing the loop" activities whereby the faculty analyze the assessment data and make improvements to the program based on this analysis. Each discipline area was asked in Spring 2018 to review the standardized test (MFT) results, analyze the data, and recommend changes. Memos from these committees, and in come cases meeting minutes are attached below.

AY 2017

During the fall 2016 semester the School of Business fulfilled its reaccreditation review by the AACSB-International. The findings from the review indicated that the school was productive in meeting its mission. The reports affiliated with this process including feedback reports from the AACSB are contained in the file library. As a result of the review process, the school is enacting multiple strategies to improve and

better align curriculum maps and assessment processes. These changes are outlined in the specific program level assessment plans and practices.

AY 2016

The School of Business has been in transition with a new Dean appointment and the addition of multiple faculty members. Inclusiveness in the assessment process is a key priority for the school and as a result of the AACSB-International assessment process, training sessions were provided for professional development for all new and returning faculty. This training was to integrate faculty into the assessment processes and to define expectations and roles related to their faculty assignments.

AY 2015

The direction that the School of Business takes going forward will include adaptations to findings from the AACSB reaccreditation review. The Kansas Department of Education is also reviewing all of its curriculum standards and it is anticipated that the outcomes of these reviews will likewise influence directions for curriculum change and adaptations. Current assessments show that students are successfully navigating the curricula for both bachelor and master level learning objectives and that students are successfully completing licensure examinations and having employment opportunities upon degree completion.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL OF BUSINESS 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL OF BUSINESS 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL OF BUSINESS 2014](#)
- [BUS_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [AACSB CIR Report 2015-2016](#)
- [AACSB CIR Report 2015-16 Appendices](#)
- [Senior Survey Results for Business Grads for AY 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL OF BUSINESS 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - School of Business - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [ACCT DCC Assessment Memo 2018Spr.docx](#)
- [BA DCC Assessment Memo 2018Spr.pdf](#)
- [BA DCC Memo Attachment 2018Spr.pdf](#)
- [BA DCC Minutes 2018-4-24.pdf](#)
- [IS DCC Assessment Memo 2018Spr.pdf](#)
- [MGT DCC NOTES 2018Spr.docx](#)
- [MKT DCC Assessment Memo 2018Spr.docx](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL OF BUSINESS 2018](#)

Program Name: Bachelor of Science (Computer Science)

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Assessment of the B.S. (Computer Science) program is done through course embedded work and other tests. Program goals and objectives and the courses in which they will be assessed have been identified. Both direct and indirect assessment techniques are used. The results of the assessment efforts are then reviewed by the departmental curriculum committees for incorporation of the assessment results in the curriculum through potential changes (closing the loop). The B.S. (Computer Science) degree was placed in the School of Business with the change occurring just prior to the beginning of the Fall 2013 term and assessment data is in the process of being gathered and analyzed. Prior to the move, the degree was housed in the Mathematics and Economics department.

BS – Computer Science Degree Program Assessment Goals

Learning Goal 1. Graduates will have analytical abilities and critical programming skills applicable to current technologies.

Learning Objective 1: Students will be able to apply logic, fundamentals of computing, software science, software development methodology and tools to developing computer systems and applications.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored project.

Learning Objective 2: Students will be able to communicate ideas and arguments in a well-organized, clear, efficient and precise way both orally and in writing, using appropriate computing terminology while working in a team environment.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored project.

Learning Objective 3: Students will be able to analyze, design, implement, and evaluate a computerized solution to a real life problem using appropriate tools.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored course embedded task.

Learning Objective 4: Students will be able to apply strong logical, analytical and mathematical skills to a wide variety of new venues needing computing solutions.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional software application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored course embedded task.

Learning Goal 2. Graduates will be knowledgeable of fundamental mathematical concepts.

Learning Objective 1: Students will be able to demonstrate competence in fundamental mathematics content.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will complete a functional mathematical application that measures 3 or higher on a 5 point scale of a rubric-scored course embedded task.

Learning Objective 2: Students will be able to demonstrate the ability to understand and develop mathematical proofs.

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

Learning Objective 3: Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate mathematics

Outcome: Seventy-five percent or more of a representative sample of students will achieve a measure of 3 or higher on a 5-point scale of a rubric-scored course-embedded task.

Attached Files

[BUS-COMPUTER SCIENCE-BS](#)

[BUS-COMPUTER SCIENCE-MI](#)

Program Name: Bachelor of Science in Business (BSB)

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Assessment in the School of Business is done at the program level and not at the level of individual majors or disciplines. This means that the School of Business assesses programs like the Bachelor of Science in Business (BSB) and not the individual majors like Business Administration, Management, Marketing, etc. In 2012-13 the School has adopted 5 goals for the BSB program and these 5 goals are the primary vehicle through which the School achieves its mission. The BSB program assessment plan includes a listing of undergraduate learning goals, assessment techniques related to each objective, and the measurements used for each objective. The School uses both direct and indirect assessment techniques. The results of the assessment efforts are then reviewed by the departmental curriculum committees for incorporation of the assessment results in the curriculum through potential changes (closing the loop). In 2014 -15 the School undertook a major revision of the BSB curriculum, including changes in the list of core classes, the Business Administration major was significantly revised, and changes were made in most other majors.

Attached Files

[BUS-ACCOUNTING-BS](#)

[BUS-ACCOUNTING-MI](#)

[BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-HUMAN RESOURCES CONCENTRATION-BS](#)

[BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS CONCENTRATION-BS](#)

- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTING-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-MARKETING COMMUNICATION CONCENT-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-SALES MANAGEMENT CONCENTRATION-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-ACCOUNTING SERVICES CONCENTRATION-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-E-COMMERCE CONCENTRATION-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-ENTREPRENEURSHIP CONCENTATION-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS ADMIN-FIN SERVICES CONCENTRATION-BS](#)
- [BUS-BUSINESS-MI](#)
- [BUS-INFORMATION SYSTEMS-BS](#)
- [BUS-INFORMATION SYSTEMS-MI](#)
- [BUS-INTEGRATED MARKETING COMMUNICATION-MI](#)
- [BUS-MANAGEMENT-BS](#)
- [BUS-MANAGEMENT-MI](#)
- [BUS-MARKETING-BS](#)
- [BUS-MARKETING-MI](#)
- [BSB Degree Program Assurance of Learning Goals final](#)
- [BSB.Assessment Plan](#)
- [BSB.Assessment.F13-SP16](#)

Program Name: Bachelor of Science in Education (BSE)

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

Overall the program is doing very well in preparing students for a career in education, though additional steps are constantly being taken to improve the program.

Results of the Praxis test indicate that our students could use better preparation in economics, money management, and business law. Changes were made to address this in fall of 2016. At the time of the most recently collected data, only half of the students had gone through the revised program, so more time is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of this change.

Feedback from cooperating teachers concerning our student teachers ranges from positive to very impressed in the area of content knowledge.

As the subject matter changes, especially in the technology area, faculty must keep up and make changes to the classes. This has happened in BE573 and BE344 for example. Another example is the change from teaching technology exclusively at the high school level to beginning in the middle school level. Our programs are changing to accommodate this. We will continue to monitor the assessment data to assess the effect of these changes.

AY 2017

The Bachelor of Science in Education program follows the assessment structure for all Kansas Department of Education teacher preparation programs. The standards (student learning outcomes) for the program and affiliated assessments evidence the successful student learning in the program. Section V of the KSDE report describes findings and future changes to facilitate student learning improvements in the program.

Based on the three-year data, the business education program at ESU is doing an above average job of preparing students for their first year as a high school business educator. There is always room for improvement, and the faculty in the business education program are constantly changing methods of teaching, assignments, and other content in order to ensure that students are well prepared to enter the secondary business education classroom.

When looking at the Praxis II Business Education Content category (Assessment 1 Data Table) results, it becomes evident that continued effort must be made to ensure that students have the content knowledge they need in the economics, money management, and business law areas. Faculty in the methods courses are trying to ensure that a major review of the curriculum in these content areas, as well as in the accounting area, occurs in BE473. Most completers take economics and personal finance their freshman or sophomore years; therefore continued efforts to review content curriculum must take place in the methods courses.

Business is a very wide-ranging content area; many students are interested in either the computer/technology side of business education or the "real business" content areas. Many will never teach all of the content they are taught while in the business education program. It is

unusual to find a student who has similar interests in both “sides” of business education. However, the data on the Praxis II and the program’s Business Education Comprehensive Content exam are similar in nature as far as problematic areas are concerned; yet the scores aren’t so low as to cause major alarms. Continued monitoring is called for so further data differences/similarities/trends can be found.

Oral feedback from cooperating teachers for business education student teachers is positive as far as the content knowledge of the students and externally validates the results of the assessment data in this report. In fact, many of the cooperating teachers during this time period have commented they are very impressed with the overall content knowledge of the students.

Business education content is constantly changing as changes in federal vocational (Perkins) legislation mandates those changes. Therefore, it is imperative that the program faculty keep abreast of the changes and modify curriculum as necessary. For example, in the methods courses (BE473 and BE483), changes have been made to reflect the change from stand-alone computer application courses at the secondary level to one of integration of technology in an application sense throughout all business education courses. Career pathways have also necessitated a change in the methods courses in terms of the courses students must be "trained to teach." New courses are being added to the curriculum at the secondary level; therefore, it is necessary to ensure that students are prepared to teach those classes. Additionally, more emphasis is being placed on the integration of academic content (common core standards) into the business education curriculum as career pathways encompass concentrators from different pathways (such as concentrators from the government pathway take courses in business law).

Because the content taught in computer applications classes for the past 30 years is now moving to the 6-8 level, additional emphasis is now placed upon teaching the middle school child. All of the implications resulting from these federal mandates/changes ensure that the ESU business education program will stay viable and current in the field of business education so that well prepared business educators enter the middle and secondary business education classrooms. Additionally, completers must have training in teaching on-line courses.

As a result of the aforementioned changes to the program from federal mandates, the program will be attending even more carefully to the assessment data to ensure that the changes are occurring in the context of candidate improvement relative to meeting the KSDE Business Standards.

Attached Files

- [BUS-BUSINESS EDUCATION-BS](#)
- [2017 Undergraduate Business Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 2 Data Table 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 2 Rubric 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 3 Data Table 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 3 Rubric 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 4 Data Table 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 4 Rubric 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 5 Data Table 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 5 Rubric 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 6 Data Table 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 6 Rubric 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Initial Assessment 7 Data Table 2012-2013](#)

- [BusEd Initial Assessment 7 Rubric 2012-2013](#)
- [BusEd Undergrad Fall 2013](#)
- [KSDE Assessment #5 - Standard 1 - computer applications theory](#)
- [KSDE Assessment #5 - Standards 5, 6, & 8 - basic business & accounting knowledge](#)
- [2017 ESU KSDE Business Education Report.docx](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 OLD Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Assessment.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Business Education Program of Study.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric.docx](#)

Program Name: Master of Accountancy (MAc)

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

The Master of Accountancy is a relatively new program that started offering classes from Fall 2013. The School has adopted goals for the MAC program and these goals are the primary vehicle through which the School achieves its mission. The MAC program assessment plan includes a listing of learning goals, assessment techniques related to each objective, and the measurements used for each objective. The School uses both direct and indirect assessment techniques. The results of the assessment efforts are then reviewed by the departmental curriculum committee for Accounting for incorporation of the assessment results in the curriculum through potential changes (closing the loop). The implementation of the assessment measures is ongoing and data should be available soon.

Learning Goal 1

Graduates will have a broader knowledge of the accounting regulatory environment and standard setting process. (related required course - AC 853 Accounting Theory)

Learning Objectives:

- a. Students conduct research presentations on specified topics in the context of standard setting or the regulatory process.
- b. Students analyze a current issue (ex. new standard, exposure draft, tax regulation) and provide information suitable for comment letters.

Learning Goal 2

Graduates will be knowledgeable of the ways information systems support the accounting function in an organization. (related required course - AC 860 Advanced Accounting Information Systems)

Learning Objectives:

- a. Students prepare an analysis of a case dealing with an ERP Systems Analysis & Design and prepare a detailed systems analysis and design plan.
- b. Students analyze a current issue (ex. Accounting systems analysis & design).

Learning Goal 3

Graduates will understand the role and use of management accounting control systems in support of multiple levels of an organization. (related required course – AC 840 Advanced Management Accounting)

Learning Objectives:

- a. Students prepare analysis of cases dealing with management accounting control systems.
- b. Students analyze a current issue (ex. Management control systems topics).

Learning Goal 4

Graduates will be able to evaluate an ethical dilemma related to accounting and consider alternative courses of action and consequences.
(related required course – AC 833 Advanced Auditing)

Learning Objectives:

- a. Students prepare analysis of cases dealing with ethical dilemmas and discuss consequences.
- b. Students analyze a current issue dealing with auditing topics.

Learning Goal 5

Graduates will have knowledge of federal income tax related to corporations and other complex entities and understand research techniques.
(related required course – AC 821 Federal Tax Research)

Learning Objectives:

- a. Students conduct research presentations on specified topics in the context of tax procedures and policy.
- b. Students analyze a current issue (ex. tax law or regulation) and use research tools.

Attached Files

[BUS-MASTER OF ACCOUNTANCY-MAC](#)[MAC.Assessment Plan](#)[MAC Learning Goals](#)**Program Name:** Master of Business Administration (MBA)**Summary of Program Assessments:****AY 2017**

Future goals for the MBA Assessment Plan to be achieved by the School of Business faculty and Student Learning Committee are as follows: 1. Finalize the revisions to the MBA learning goals and outcomes, benchmarks and triggers. 2. Review the alignment of core courses with the revised learning goals. 3. Develop an assessment plan that spans a two-year period. 4. Identify assessment tasks and rubrics that align with learning objectives. 5. Address the following additional issues in the assessment plan: a. Critical thinking, global issues and social responsibility enhancement. Faculty professional development exercises will be utilized for this purpose. b. Separate assessment data for International and American students to discern where gaps are the greatest. The standardized tests are already designed in this way but course-embedded assessments will also be designed in this way. c. Inter-rater reliability. Faculty professional development exercises will be utilized for this purpose. d. Processes for improving student learning. e. Teams versus individual student assessment. Although individual student assessment is necessary for student success, program assessment occurs at the program level. However, individual students, rather than teams of students should be assessed so as to ensure that students are not represented only by the performance of the best students in a group. f. Value-added design. Implemented only if meaningful and feasible. 6. Learn how to use Baseline and Compliance Assist for assessment purposes.

Attached Files

[BUS-MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION-MBA](#)[PASL Business Administration MBA](#)[MBA Degree Program Assurance of Learning Goals final](#)[MBA.Assessment Plan](#)[MBA.Assessment.2013-16](#)**Program Name:** Master of Science in Business Education (MSBE)**Summary of Program Assessments:****AY2018**

This program has been scheduled for discontinuance.

AY 2017

The Department of Business Administration & Education follows the school and university process for curricular change and implementation. Curricular issues related to business education are reviewed by all business education faculty members within the department on a yearly basis. After curriculum changes are discussed and approved by the business education faculty, those changes are brought to the full departmental faculty for approval, sent to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in the School of Business as well as the School of Business Chairs Council for approval prior to being communicated to the entire campus community for their reaction. At that stage, the Advanced Program Committee (consisting of graduate faculty from education programs across campus) reviews the proposed changes. All approved changes are forwarded to the University Provost and President for final approval.

The business education faculty members review all assessment data on an annual basis. During this review, faculty members take the opportunity to discuss assessment components, the data results, and the components relevant to the outcomes of the degree program. Because of results of a previous follow-up survey of candidates, the entire curriculum was reviewed but no changes related to the assessments reported in this document were made. Faculty discussed the courses certain assessments are administered in but decided not to make any changes. Outside influences on curricular change (such as business teacher shortages) were also discussed by the business education faculty. Changes in course content have been made in order to prepare these Master's students with the latest technological skills. However, the assessment tools described in this report are generic and evaluate general principles and concepts so changes in computer software or technology have not affected the assessment tools used to measure whether Standards for this program have been met.

The business education faculty review data closely. The current data as presented in this report indicates that all Master of Science in Business Education program candidates have met and, in many cases, have exceeded minimum requirements in terms of meeting the Standards. However, following a continuous improvement philosophy, faculty are using not only results of these assessments, but also follow-up surveys, enrollment reports, requirements for alternative licensure students, and other data as they review the current curriculum in this degree program. Those factors are beyond the scope of this report. Other external factors such as changes in technology as well as state and federal funded business education programs in Kansas may affect Emporia State University's Master of Science in Business Education curriculum in the future.

Attached Files

- [BUS-BUSINESS EDUCATION-MS](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data 2012-13](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data 2011-12](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data 2011-12](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data 2012-13](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data 2011-2012](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data 2012-2013](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data 2011-12](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data 2012-2013](#)
- [Assessment 6 Grading Criteria](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data 2011-12](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data 2012-2013](#)
- [Assessment 7 Survey form](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data 2011-12](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data 2012-2013](#)
- [Assessment 8 Grading Criteria](#)
- [Assessment 9 Data 2012](#)
- [Assessment 9 Data 2012-2013](#)
- [Assessment 9 Data 2013](#)
- [Assessment 9 Grading Criteria](#)
- [BusinessAdvProgRpt2013](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The School of Business is working diligently to proactively redesign its assessment practices to align with those requirements of the AACSB, the Kansas Board of Education, and in conjunction with ensuring the adequacy and currency of the degree programs and concentrations currently offered. The faculty assessment teams have had to redesign some of their curriculum maps and learning goals. This has set them back slightly on their course based assessment practices, although the ETS major field tests were still administered. Taking the time to confirm the terminology used when identifying student learning goals, objectives, and outcomes will result in assessment practices and data that serves well to inform change decisions. Across the board, your efforts in intentionally establishing an appropriate assessment infrastructure will be advantageous in keeping the curriculum current and continuously improving the student learning experience.

The faculty participated in the assessment of the school's general education courses and this participation is greatly appreciated. Faculty involvement in reporting their course assessments using the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting tool was productive for the BSB and CS degree programs. It is anticipated that as the assessment plans are finalized that individual faculty reporting of their course-embedded assessments will increase and be represented as identified in the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Plans for the respective degree programs.

I see some impending assessment opportunities including the alignment of course-embedded assessments for those same courses offered in online, face-to-face, and online accelerated delivery modes. The onus of proof that a course learning experience is consistent across multiple delivery modes is on the institution. Designing a common assessment tool (rubric), a common assignment (case-study), or common learning experience across courses with dual or triple type delivery modes can provide the evidence that the learning experience is the same. Regardless of the assessment results, if there is differentiation, the assessment identifies where the prioritization of change strategies should occur.

You will be implementing two new degree programs in the upcoming year. I have added 5-Year Program Level Assessment Plans for each and it will be important for these assessment planning templates to be populated with the appropriate assessment plan implementation strategies. The upcoming academic year looks to be a challenging yet productive time for the School of Business faculty as they operationalize their degree program assessment plans. The hard work is being done as planning assessment practices and curriculum mapping can be extremely time consuming. I look forward to assisting in your assessment endeavors in the upcoming academic year.

Academic Year 2017

The assessment practices that are being applied and the changes that the school is making as related to the feedback report from the AACSB-International will position the programs for success in the upcoming years. There have been many transitions that the school has adapted to over the past three-years as changes in leadership and in the faculty has continued to challenge the continuity of assessment strategies. With that said, the chair and faculty who are involved in designing, implementing, and reporting assessment efforts do a nice job of ensuring that the quality of the students educational experience remains at the forefront of change strategies resulting from assessment practices. The changes that you address to be forthcoming resulting from the outcomes of the AACSB reaccreditation efforts should be beneficial. It is through these external lenses that we are able to extend our knowledge of best practices and to adapt to those opportunities that otherwise wouldn't be a part of our improvement strategies. It is recognized that the school just went through curriculum mapping updates prior to the reaccreditation visit and that one of the recommendations was to disaggregate student skills resulting in the need to update a couple of the curriculum maps again. I have uploaded the new versions of the curriculum maps that are stored in the faculty qualifications folder and have saved them in the department level assessment under the degree type (Bachelor versus Master) template accordingly. The addition of all of the minor cognate areas of study is impressive and should bode well for the increases in enrollment that the school desires. The school is moving forward in a positive direction, enrollments are holding steady and growing in some areas. Having a full faculty and being able to have assessment groups for each of the major programs will be beneficial as well. You have done a very nice job of identifying the courses scheduled for assessment in years two through four for all of your 5-Year Program Assessment Cycles. Your faculty should find the reporting of their course embedded assessments convenient using the assessment reporting tool. Keep up the dedication to the assessment processes and the results in enhanced student success will be the outcome. Good Job!

Academic Year 2016

The School of Business continues to organize its assessment practices as it evolves. The addition of new programs and minors is a positive sign that the school is positioning itself for success. With this growth, comes the need to organize assessment practices and integrate these processes into existing ones. The addition of the online MAc degree and the computer science degree being placed within the school are two examples of program expansion, and the addition of multiple minors complicates the assessment processes as well. It is noted that the assessments for the computer science program are still being defined as the learning objectives are outlined, but the courses identified for embedded assessments are not shown. Structurally, completing the curriculum map and uploading it into skybox and this interface is important. This curriculum map for the CS program is vital to operationalizing the assessment plan. It will be important to devise an action plan to review the program on a regular scheduled basis. The existing CS assessment plan calls for course embedded assessments, but there are not any affiliated data files showing this assessment process is taking place. In related curriculum mapping, the curriculum maps for the

BSB associated minors and concentrations are also a part of the mapping process that is being completed. The mapping may be consolidated for minors and concentrations into the program maps by identifying the contributions of all courses offered within the respective degree program and identifying those courses that are affiliated with particular minors/concentrations. It is anticipated that completion will occur in the fall term with files uploaded to the SKYBOX-Faculty Qualifications folder accordingly.

The degree program assessment plans and data evidence documents show that the student learning outcomes are being tracked with three year trends. The assessment infrastructure that exists for the BSB program is well done, there are program level learning outcomes, goals, objectives, and performance thresholds set for both course embedded assessments and for external direct measures (ETS-BCTST). The ETS critical thinking major field test examination is a graduation requirement, creating a high stakes motivation for students to perform well.

This assessment plan and accompanying data shows that the program is accomplishing its goals and is preparing for the sharing of information with AACSB. The MBA program has the same assessment plan and infrastructure as the BSB program. This is a nice set-up for tracking the percentages of students achieving passing scores on the ETS major field test. There are also additional assessment/evaluation metrics provided by embedded coursework, external reviewers, and with student exit surveys. This multiple-point perspective continues to inform the curriculum changes necessary to remain competitive in the market. For the MAc, the assessment plan and learning goals infrastructure is in place and the location for course embedded assessments has been identified. With this program being online, you may want to look at leveraging the capabilities of the Canvas LMS and using the outcomes function to gather assessment data. This would allow alignment and capture of assessment data across student learning goals as identified within the course embedded assignments. As soon as data is available from these assessments along with the findings and recommendations for improvement, please upload files to this interface. This assessment plan appears to be sound as well, but not as far along in the process as the BSB and MBA assessment plans.

Over the past two years, School of Business faculty have participated in assessing the BU Ethics course in relation to critical thinking and the contribution the course makes to achieving general education program learning outcomes. These three faculty scored student works from the course using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Critical Thinking Skills. One of the thoughts for use of this data was to look at the alignment between the AAC&U Value Rubric and the ETS Major Field test. Perhaps, there is an opportunity to look at a pre-test, post-test scenario where the value added or growth in critical thinking skills can be measured. This comparison may be useful to informing curricular change.

The assessment operations for the School of Business, while we can always improve, are sound and should provide the information needed to continuously improve and adapt to a quickly evolving educational environment and meet re-accreditation needs.

Academic Year 2015

The assessment plan for the School of Business is comprehensive and structured to provide many focus areas for consistently insuring and improving student learning. The strength of the plan is in its underlying structure where small groups of faculty consistently review student learning objectives and the outcomes of the learning experiences. This structure insures that all components of each program are under continuous review and provided sufficient attention. This continuous review process insures that the curriculum remains current and that faculty are consistently engaged in meeting curriculum adaptations of a highly dynamic business environment. Challenges to the continuity of this structure will be related to the high numbers of new faculty in the school. This also presents opportunities as well. Ideas and expertise from new faculty members can be a great change agent and integrating the expertise of all faculty will make the programs stronger and more adaptable. It will be crucial to pay particular attention to the assessment findings that come from the MBA program as the transition to a completely online program may pose unique challenges especially in the first few years. Meeting students needs may change a bit when it comes to learning in an online environment. The School of Business will have opportunities to influence its assessment plans when it receives feedback from the AACSB reaccreditation process, be sure to include the report and feedback from AACSB in the next reporting cycle. Great Job! Keep up the good work!

Providing Department: School of Business

Responsible Roles: Liz Diers (e11091546), Joyce Zhou (E10341110), Marc Fusaro (e11099230), Jeffrey Muldoon (E11072730)

5-YEAR ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Accountancy MAc

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The assessment plan for the Master of Accountancy program will begin year one of this assessment cycle and report findings for the capstone course as of Academic Year 2019. The 2019, 2020, and 2021 academic years will include continuation of the capstone experience assessments and reporting summary.

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2019

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2020

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2021

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2022

Attached Files

[BUS-MASTER OF ACCOUNTANCY-MAC](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Summary of Year 2 (Academic Year 2019)

Assess Courses, Fall 2017: AC853, AC840, AC821

Assess Courses, Spring 2018: AC860, AC833

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 3 (Academic Year 2020)

Assess Courses, Fall 2018: AC 853, AC840, AC821

Assess Courses, Spring 2019: AC860, AC833

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 4 (Academic Year 2021)

Assess Courses, Fall 2019: AC853, AC840, AC821

Assess Courses, Spring 2020: AC860, AC833

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

In Year 5 of the cycle, we will prepare the Executive Summary Assessment Report and continue to gather and compile assessment data for the capstone course to be carried forward into the next 5-year assessment cycle.

Assess Courses, Fall 2020: AC853, AC840, AC821

Assess Courses, Spring 2021: AC860, AC833

Providing Department: Master of Accountancy (MAc)

Responsible Roles: Liz Diers (e11091546), Marc Fusaro (e11099230), Jeffrey Muldoon (E11072730)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Business Administration MBA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

In addition to assessment at the individual course level, the Major Field Test in Business is administered every semester to assess the MBA program. MG899

The assessment plan for the Master of Business Administration program will begin year one of this assessment cycle and report findings for the MG899 course and the Major Field Test as of Academic Year 2018. The 2019, 2020, and 2021 academic years will include

continuation of these assessments and reporting summary.

Summary of MG899 and MFT Assessments for Academic Year 2017

Summary of MG899 and MFT Assessments for Academic Year 2018

Summary of MG899 and MFT Assessments for Academic Year 2019

Summary of MG899 and MFT Assessments for Academic Year 2020

Attached Files

[BUS-MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION-MBA](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Summary of Year 2 (Academic Year 2019)

Assess Courses, Fall 2017: MG853, MK864,

Assess Courses, Spring 2018: MK864, MG899

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 3 (Academic Year 2020)

Assess Courses, Fall 2018: MK864, MG899

Assess Courses, Spring 2019: MG 853, MK864, MG899

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 4 (Academic Year 2021)

Assess Courses, Fall 2019: MK864, MG899

Assess Courses, Spring 2020: MK864, MG899

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

In Year 5 of the cycle, we will prepare the Executive Summary Assessment Report and continue to gather and compile assessment data for the MG899 course and the MFT to be carried forward into the next 5-year assessment cycle.

Assess Courses, Fall 2020: MG853, MK864, MG899

Assess Courses, Spring 2021: MK864, MG899

Providing Department: Master of Business Administration (MBA)

Responsible Roles: Joyce Zhou (E10341110), Marc Fusaro (e11099230), Jeffrey Muldoon (E11072730)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Business BSB

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The Major Field Test in Business is administered every semester to assess the BSB program (LG1, LG3, LG4).

The BCTST is administered every semester to assess the BSB program (LG2).

The assessment plan for the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration program will begin year one of this assessment cycle and report findings for the Major Field Test in Business and BCTST as of Academic Year 2018. The 2019, 2020, and 2021 academic years will include continuation of the capstone experience assessments and reporting summary.

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2018

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2019

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2020

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2021

Attached Files

[BUS-BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS - BSB](#)

[Fusaro-Marc-BC103-FA17.pdf](#)

[Lovett-Steven-BU293-FA17.pdf](#)

[Muldoon-Jeffrey-BU293-SP18.pdf](#)

[Lovett-Steven-BU293-SP18.pdf](#)

[Chavarria-Juan-IS213-SP18.pdf](#)

[Yu-Jun-MK301-SP18.pdf](#)

[Yu-Jun-MK453-SP18.pdf](#)

[Smith-Douglass-IS113-SP18.pdf](#)

[Yu-Jun-MK510-SP18.pdf](#)

[Yu-Jun-MK864-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Summary of Year 2 (Academic Year 2019)

Assess Courses, Fall 2017: MG301, BU353, MG473, IS113, IS213, AC223, MK301

Assess Courses, Spring 2018: MK301, BU353

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 3 (Academic Year 2020)

Assess Courses, Fall 2018: BC103, MK301, MG473

Assess Courses, Spring 2019: MG301, BU353, MG473, IS113, IS213, AC223, MK301

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 4 (Academic Year 2021)

Assess Courses, Fall 2019: MK301, BU353

Assess Courses, Spring 2020: BC103, MK301, MG473

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

In Year 5 of the cycle, we will prepare the Executive Summary Assessment Report and continue to gather and compile assessment data for the Major Field Test and BCTST to be carried forward into the next 5-year assessment cycle.

Assess Courses, Fall 2020: MG301, BU353, MG473, IS113, IS213, AC223, MK301

Assess Courses, Spring 2021: MK301, BU353, BC103, MG473

Providing Department: Bachelor of Science in Business (BSB)

Responsible Roles: Joyce Zhou (E10341110), Marc Fusaro (e11099230), Jeffrey Muldoon (E11072730)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1**Computer Science BS**

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The assessment plan for the Computer Science program will begin year one of this assessment cycle and report findings for the capstone course as of Academic Year 2018. The 2019, 2020, and 2021 academic years will include continuation of the capstone experience assessments and reporting summary.

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2019

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2020

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2021

Summary of Capstone Assessments for Academic Year 2022

Fall 2017: CS220, CS355

Assess Courses, Spring 2018: CS260, CS552

Attached Files

[BUS-Computer Science-BS](#)

[Chavarria-Juan-IS213-SP18.pdf](#)

[Fan-Liden-CS220-SP18.pdf](#)

[Smith-Douglass-IS113-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Summary of Year 2 (Academic Year 2019)

Assess Courses, Fall 2018: CS340, CS561

Assess Courses, Spring 2019: CS555, CS557

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 3 (Academic Year 2020)

Assess Courses, Fall 2019: CS220, CS355

Assess Courses, Spring 2020: CS260, CS552

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Summary of Year 4 (Academic Year 2021)

Assess Courses, Fall 2020: CS340, CS561

Assess Courses, Spring 2021: CS555, CS557

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

In Year 5 of the cycle, we will prepare the Executive Summary Assessment Report and continue to gather and compile assessment data for the capstone course to be carried forward into the next 5-year assessment cycle.

Assess Courses, Fall 2021: CS260, CS552

Assess Courses, Spring 2022: CS555, CS557

Providing Department: Bachelor of Science (Computer Science)

Responsible Roles: Liz Diers (e11091546), Marc Fusaro (e11099230), Jeffrey Muldoon (E11072730)

UNIT REPORT

**School of Library and Information Management Assessment
Report 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:19 AM

**SLIM Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

During 2018, SLIM will proceed with assessments of PhD student learning described in the SLIM PhD 5-Year Plan for assessment. In the MLS program, we will continue with course level assessment of student learning through the use of common course assignments combined with student self-assessment of course learning outcomes. This year the focus will be on LI804, LI810, and LI855. Some changes to MLS curriculum supported by assessment data from AY2017 will be implemented .

AY 2017

SLIM continues the course-level assessment of student learning, as well as program-level previously conducted. Minor curriculum changes were made during Academic year ending 2017, with support materials and narrative attached below. Annual Assessment has been enhanced with a change in instructor of LI880, a course designed to track student success in previous course and the ability to look for learning themes throughout their program.

AY 2016

During the academic year, SLIM received reaccreditation from the ALA as the site visit by the COA in the fall of 2015 was a success. SLIM has done much work on the assessing of the entire program for the MLS and affiliated Library Media Specialist licensure. A complete report for the self-study is included in the evidence files.

AY 2015 SLIM maintains a regular schedule of assessment of individual student learning and of program and curriculum evaluation. Data are used to track individual student progress, general achievement of SLIM's Program Outcomes and Professional Values, and the achievement of each individual course's Course Learning Outcomes through both direct and indirect measures. Data is also used to show the comparability of classes across cohorts, which is a requirement of the accreditation process.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

In the MLS program, we continued with course level assessment of student learning through the use of common course assignments combined with student self-assessment of course learning outcomes. This year the focus was on LI804, LI810, and LI855.

The change strategies from our assessment practices for this past year for the SLIM MLS curriculum are:

- Removed the LI 800 prerequisite for LI 819
- Added LI 844 as a choice for the Informatics Concentration
- Changed LI 874 Informatics Internship from 6 to 3 credit hours
- Changed the structure of the Informatics Certificate, with three required courses and a choice of three additional courses from a menu of four courses.

Assessment of procedures and practices for the MLS program included:

- Full time faculty tested the use of the ESU Faculty Course Assessment Reporting tool at the end of Spring 2018. Challenges identified with its use include:
- Drop down list of courses included several errors: courses and/or course numbers that are no longer taught or the titles of which

have changed.

- Survey closed before several faculty were able to complete it.
- Survey data is only directly available to (e.g. must be requested from) the ESU Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness (Jo Kord).

The following recommendations are identified for the upcoming 2019 academic year:

1. Create our own course assessment reporting tool (in Baseline) in order to overcome the challenges reported above and customize it to our program (e.g. assessing graduate programs).
2. Expand common assignment data collection and reporting to all MLS core courses, whether they are taught by full-time faculty or national adjunct faculty.
3. Ask SLIM faculty who teach 810 to come to consensus on a common assignment.
4. SLIM full-time faculty should provide measurable feedback of their assessments of students' capstone portfolios.
5. Discussing with full-time faculty the use of common rubrics mapped directly to course learning outcomes for common assignments in core courses, making it easier to obtain summative data on student achievement of course learning outcomes.
6. Draft a SLIM MLS 5-Year Plan for assessment (or revise if one already exists), patterned on the SLIM PhD 5-Year Plan for assessment.

AY 2017

For the Ph.D. program: Five Fundamental Elements of Excellent Qualifying Exams (Content Areas) Students are required to successfully complete qualifying examinations (see Doctoral Handbook, 2016). As the title of this exercise implies, these examinations serve to separate those students who do and those students who do not meet the criteria for undertaking dissertation research. The purpose of qualifying examinations is to provide the student an opportunity to demonstrate her/his eligibility to move forward in the program. (Dr. Dow). Additional support files attached below (PhD Support).

AY 2016

It is acknowledged that the reaccreditation was a success and there is a solid structure in place to continue to operate through connections with the strategic plan, program level learning objectives, and the cohesion of the curriculum across all sites. This plan will continue to be actualized as the data collection methods are in place and we will continue to make positive progress in continually improving student learning. Next year's focus will be to assess the quality of the PhD program, an external reviewer will be brought to campus to work towards the new design of an assessment program that is structured in the same fashion as the MLS which has proven to be useful in navigating change and keeping the program current and student learning at high success levels.

AY 2015

The current curriculum review is now moving beyond the stage of addressing individual courses requirements and content, and even program content and requirement, to more global considerations of the way in which individual courses interact with each other and the creation of an ideal sequence.

At this stage, adjustments have been made over the past three years to the sequencing of the required courses to ensure both a logical progression of ideas and skills, but also to ensure that elective courses, particularly those in concentrations, are fully supported by the timing of the core courses, and that students have the required knowledge to complete various course requirements.

This attention to the interaction and sequence of courses has allowed for the identification and implementation of such ideas as the Research Literacy core that extends across the first four required courses: LI 801 Foundations of Library and Information Science, LI 810 Research in Library and Information Science, LI 802 Information-Seeking Behavior and Reference Services, and LI 804 Organization of Information. The faculty teaching all four of these courses have worked collaboratively to ensure that students complete the first two quarters with a solid foundation of research literacy that then enables them to advance to greater learning in subsequent semesters of the program. A recent addition to the SLIM assessment plan has been the use of Course Learning Outcomes as additional questions in the IDEA surveys. Students are asked to rate their own achievement on the Course Learning Outcomes, and this gives an additional data point that can be particularly helpful in identifying elements of a course that one faculty member may do extremely well, allowing other faculty teaching that course to benefit from a discussion of how those concepts or ideas are taught, and affording the opportunity to make changes. This is also an illustration of the way in which the SLIM faculty are choosing to work together in a mutually supportive way that benefits both their own teaching and the students' learning.

A review of curriculum in the Ph.D. program will begin in fall 2015. The structure of the program is radically different from that of the MLS and the review necessitates a different approach. All Ph.D. programs are evaluated with the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction, including the student assessment of Course Learning Outcomes.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - SLIM 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SLIM 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SLIM 2014](#)
- [12 Learning Activity](#)
- [2014 Student Report](#)
- [Five Fundamental Elements of Excellent Qualifying Exams](#)
- [Five Fundamental Elements of Excellent Qualifying Exams\[1\]](#)
- [LI890XR Course Syllabus Spring 2016](#)
- [LI891 2014 Info Transfer 6 Module manuscript assignment instructions and rubric](#)
- [LI891 2014 Info Transfer Digital Illustration Assignment Rubric](#)
- [LI891XR Syllabus Fall 2014](#)
- [LI892 LI892 2017 Psy of Info 6 Manuscript instructions and rubric](#)
- [LI892XR Syllabus Spring 2017](#)
- [LI940 summer 2015 Essay 7 Instructions and rubric](#)
- [LI940XR Syllabus Summer 2015](#)
- [SP 2016 summer and fall student report](#)
- [Course Titles Descriptions and Learning Outcomes May 9 2015 final with revisions](#)
- [SLIM Assessment Plan 2015](#)
- [SLIM Program Outcomes and Professional Values](#)
- [Strategic Plan April 22 2015 approved](#)
- [Student Assessment of Course Learning Objectives](#)
- [Summary Curriculum Map ALA Core Competences](#)
- [Summary Curriculum Map SLIM Program Objectives and Professional Values](#)
- [Summary Data Core Curriculum Common Assessment](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SLIM 2017](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SLIM 2018](#)
- [Dow-Mirah-LI802-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Fay-Brendan-LI802-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Ma-Jinxuan-LI810-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Rocci-Keith-LI805-AY18.pdf](#)
- [Sutton-Sarah-LI804-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Fay-Brendan-LI855-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Sutton-Sarah-LI894-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Sutton-Sarah-LI855-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Widdersheim-Michael-LI804-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name: Concentrations - Licensure

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY2018

Some changes to MLS curriculum supported by assessment data from AY2017 were approved by faculty vote and, in most cases, ESU Graduate Council, for implementation as noted below.

Informatics concentration/certificate:

- Removed the LI 800 prerequisite for LI 819
- Added LI 844 as a choice for the Informatics Concentration.
- Changed LI 874 Informatics Internship from 6 to 3 credit hours
- Changed the structure of the Informatics Certificate, with three required courses and a choice of three additional courses from a menu of four courses.

[Evidence: 2017-18 Academic Year MLS and Concentration Assessment Summary.docx, uploaded 2018-6-28]

AY2017

Several specific concentrations are offered that allow students to prepare for various roles within a library or information organization. Currently there are concentrations in Leadership and Administration (approved Spring 2012), Archives Studies (approved Fall 2011), Youth

Services (approved Fall 2011, revised Fall 2014), and Informatics (approved Fall 2015). See Appendix 2 for exact course learning outcomes. Students with a concentration receive an acknowledgement on their transcript that lists the appropriate concentration completed.

These concentrations are structured within the curriculum of the MLS program and are assessed as a part of the coursework for the MLS, accordingly.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 1 Praxis Data 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Instructional Unit Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Instructional Unit Data 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Practicum Data 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Practicum Reflective Journals Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Practicum Notebook Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Practicum Reflective journals Data 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Course Grade Data 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Collaborative Lesson Plan Data 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Collaborative Lesson Plan Rubric.docx](#)
- [School Library Media Specialist Licensure Program of Study.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7 Media Lesson Data 2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Media Lesson Rubric.docx](#)
- [ESU LibraryMediaSpec Template2015_NewStandards 2017 report.docx](#)
- [2017-18 Academic Year MLS and Concentration Assessment Summary.docx](#)

Program Name: Library and Information Management PhD

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2016-2017

The PhD program is going to be a priority for the upcoming two years. After receiving reaccreditation for the MLS program from the ALA, the emphasis will now shift to improving the assessment of the PhD program. The infrastructure for the program exists with the completed curriculum map and the student learning outcomes aligning with the program level outcomes in all syllabi. This process was completed as a part of the self-study which occurred this past fall 2015. The next step is to bring an external consultant to campus to provide some ideas for improving the assessment of the program and to recommend based on findings direction on maintaining the integrity of the program and the potential to improve/grow the program. In addition, PhD program faculty will convene to begin working on a strategy to improve the assessment program that informs student success at all levels of achievement.

Attached Files

- [SLM-LIBRARY SCIENCE-PHD-CURRICULUM MAP](#)

Program Name: Master of Library Science MLS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

Course level assessment of student learning

In the MLS program, we continued with course level assessment of student learning through the use of common course assignments combined with student self-assessment of course learning outcomes. This year the focus was on LI804, LI810, and LI855.

Mean and median course level common assignment grades for LI804, LI810, and LI855 are all above 90%, A- in the SLIM grading rubric, suggesting that appropriate student learning is occurring. For LI810 two different common assignments were used, this should be resolved during 2018-19 among full time faculty teaching LI810. Common assignment grade data was collected from most MLS core courses taught by SLIM full-time faculty during 2017-18. Recommendations for 2018-19 include expanding common assignment data collection to all MLS core courses, whether they are taught by full-time faculty or national adjunct faculty.

Supporting data can be found in 2017-18 Academic Year MLS and Concentration Assessment Summary.docx, attached.

Student self-assessment of achievement of course learning outcomes

In all core courses examined (804, 810, 855), the majority of students agreed or strongly agreed that they were able to do all course learning outcomes at the end of the semester. In 810, the majority of student strongly agreed that they were able to do all course learning outcomes at the end of the semester.

Supporting data can be found in 2017-18 Academic Year MLS and Concentration Assessment Summary.docx, attached.

Changes to SLIM MLS curriculum

Some changes to MLS curriculum supported by assessment data from AY2017 were approved by faculty vote and, in most cases, ESU Graduate Council, for implementation as noted below.

Summary of changes in the MLS curriculum

- Course sequence in Fig. 1 below approved by faculty vote to begin in Fall 2019.
- Core curriculum requirements: technology course requirement continues as a part of the core but allows students to choose a technology course to meet the requirement: either 815, 843, 844, or another approved technology course.

Fig. 1, new course sequence can be found in 2017-18 Academic Year MLS and Concentration Assessment Summary.docx, attached.

AY 2017

The assessment of the MLS program is comprehensive and is coordinated among all sites. The feedback from the COA shows that the infrastructure of the curriculum and the alignment of the SLIM program strategic plan with the University Strategic plan is concise and is built upon multiple goals and objectives. The curriculum is structured in a fashion that defined cohorts are accepted in both fall and spring terms. These cohorts navigate the curriculum in specific course sequences. This provides a highly effective way of education MLS students and the retention and completion metrics support this. The Media Specialist Licensure Program is included in the curriculum for the MLS. The comprehensive descriptions and supporting evidence for the MLS assessment program is presented in evidence files in the file library.

Integrative Curriculum Planning Changes of titles were made in a few courses in the management stream of curriculum. 2017-18 will include changes in the Concentrations and Certificates in both of these areas. Supporting materials for these changes are included in dashboard as attached files. Additionally, the Dean included a recent MLS survey that looks to assess programs of LIS education. This document will prove informative on the curriculum assessment level moving forward for the MLS program.

Attached Files

- [Leadership Certificate](#)
- [LI 805 approved](#)
- [LI 850](#)
- [LI 863 approved](#)
- [MLS skills and content areas -- Survey](#)
- [SLM-LIBRARY SCIENCE-MLS-CURRICULUM MAP](#)
- [SLM-LIBRARY SCIENCE-MLS-ALA-CORE-COMPETENCIES](#)
- [ACCREDITATION 2015 FINAL VERSION 8 24 2015 Rev 10 19 2015](#)
- [2017-18 Academic Year MLS and Concentration Assessment Summary.docx](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The progress in advancing the curriculum and affiliated change strategies in your assessment practices for the MLS program provide conclusive evidence that the assessment plan strategies are effective and leading to incremental program improvement. The 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan for the PH.D program has continued to be developed and it is now set up with a high level of precision and the approach is unique, but I believe this current 5-year cycle will be very informative in navigating change. I do think that setting the MLS program up in the same or similar format will be beneficial. Currently, the SLIM curriculum is well designed and documented in regard to curriculum mapping and CLO alignment. You have made significant progress in common assignment assessments across the majority of your courses. I encourage the commitment/movement to have your faculty develop common assignments whenever applicable. With the existing curriculum design and alignment, and the use of a cohort model, this next step (common assignments inclusive in all course sections) only strengthens the program curricula. It also allows for information learned from assessment practices to be applied centrally and generally across those courses where curriculum adaptations are warranted. Another plus to this strategy is the confirmation that the learning is comparable across all course sections, thus confirming the integrity of the curriculum. In reading the faculty's feedback for the new assessment reporting tool and the recommended actions going forward, it may be more beneficial for SLIM to develop their own survey (assessment reporting tool). The institution-wide tool has its set of weaknesses, but does serve as the platform for all faculty to report their course embedded assessments. Updating the currency of the course listings is an easy fix. But, whatever strategy best fits the needs of the SLIM faculty in reporting their course embedded assessments is supported by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The only caveat is

that the course embedded assessment efforts of the faculty are captured on an annual basis, so this information can be evidenced on behalf of our institution-wide assessment efforts as well. And, your building the survey in the Campus Labs Baseline module serves this need. Overall, it is evident that the SLIM faculty have assessment practices in place, are gathering data of both direct and indirect assessments, and are applying the findings to improve the programs and the student learning experiences. It appears that the faculty are engaged and have ownership in the assessment of their respective courses and the programs in general. This is excellent and much appreciated! Thanks for all you do!

Academic Year 2017

This year's assessment reporting for the School of Library and Information Management and the affiliated file library shows that some extensive time and effort has been put into coordinating their assessment efforts for both the MLS and PhD programs. It is encouraging to see the supporting documentation of course design, rubrics, and assessment practices for tracking student success throughout the programs.

These key evidence elements speak volumes to the type of assessment strategies that are being employed and shows a clear pathway whereby students navigate the curriculum. The cohort methodology used for the programs is a best practice that allows for maximization of effectiveness and efficiency in the use of faculty expertise and instructional assignments. The completion of the school's assessment plan template for this past year, and the design and implementation of the 5-Year Program Assessment Cycle plan for the PhD program, should serve the school well as it adapts assessment practices to include all courses in the curriculum. As soon as support documentation is available for the Certifications section, please upload them into the file library. It is recognized that Informatics has been moved to the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences where content specific minors will be aligned with the technical components of the program, therefore no need to assess and report on Informatics going forward. The information for the KSDE assessment and reporting for the Library Media Specialist can be uploaded to the file library as it becomes available as well. The KSDE program reports are due as of October 2017, so those files should be available for the 2018 academic reporting cycle. Overall, I am happy to see that the SLIM is extending their assessment reporting efforts and the collaboration is greatly appreciated. The information presented in this year's assessment template reporting confirms the quality and efficacy of the SLIM assessment practices. Keep up the good work!

Academic Year 2016

SLIM has had a successful year in regard to receiving reaccreditation from the ALA. It is encouraging to see the efforts and expertise expended in bringing together the information and evidence files for the self-study report. The school was also commended in the 2015 HLC follow-up report in regard to the alignment between program level goals and syllabi student learning outcomes. And, for the quality of the student learning outcomes. In addition, the plans for the upcoming year for engaging faculty and an external consultant to improve the assessment practices in the PhD program should serve SLIM well. If possible, I would like to be able to spend some time with the external consultant during his/her time on campus. Keep up the good work and I'm looking forward to reviewing the outcomes from the 2017 assessment planning and reporting.

Academic Year 2015

There has been some really good work done on the organizational structure of the assessment plan and the implementation of strategies to align the curriculum with particular detail to course sequencing and same assignments to measure student learning outcomes. The summative assessments showing course level analysis of assignments across the geographical regions benchmarks threshold scores and trends over the past six terms. These data confirm that students are learning at expected levels and shows region by region descriptive statistics. Combining the data from all regions to determine mean scores and then compare region means to the overall mean would show above and below mean performance by region. Because each of these regional cohorts consist of different students, you may find it beneficial to look at some learning outcomes at the formative level and report out as well. This formative information with comments from the faculty about how they are intending to change curriculum/pedagogy to improve student learning would nicely complement the good work that is being done. Your previous assessment data had some of this formative (individual course level) data and analysis included but I didn't see any evidence documents in this report. You are on a good pathway, keep moving and adapting as you see fit. Looking at assessments by program (MLS, Ph.D., Certificates) should be included in your next year's reporting cycle as the template areas have been built to accommodate reporting at the program level. You can attach evidence files of formative assessments and give an overview in the respective areas for each program. Your ALA reaccreditation feedback should provide some information for strategies going forward.

Providing Department: School of Library and Information Management

Responsible Roles: Wooseob Jeong (E11097473), Mirah Dow (E10088217), Sarah Sutton (E10876844), Jim Walther (E11090740)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Library and Information Management PhD

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

YEAR ON

- Begin in fall 2016 offering courses with existing curriculum
- Based on curriculum map, all course learning outcomes are aligned to course learning outcomes. Review, revise and/or create new course assignments and assignment evaluations.
- Align assignment rubrics with course learning outcomes
- Faculty discuss use of new learning outcomes and student achievement (scores on various learning objective; determine appropriateness of choice of words/concepts stated in learning outcomes in each course as courses are taught using the approved course schedule (6 semesters). Make minor revisions to wording as necessary.

YEAR ONE 1. Fall 2016-spring 2016, Offer 2, 3-credit hour courses fall and spring semesters using revised curriculum. LI900; LI903, LI891; LI904; LI892

First Fall Semester 2016: LI900 Orientation, 1 credit; LI903 Research Philosophy, 3 credit hours; LI891 Seminar in Info Transfer, 3 credit hours

Course Offering by Course Numbers, Titles, Credit Hours, Name of Teaching Professor:

LI 900 Introductory Doctoral Seminar (1 hour, pass/fail)

An introduction to the SLIM doctoral program, to doctoral work, and to the culture of the researcher. Taught by M. Dow, fall 2016

Tier I - LI 903 Research Philosophy (3 credit hours, letter grade)

Examines various constructs of science in society. Emphasis is placed on identifying assumptions about human nature, defining a researcher's view of the social world, and identifying basic paradigms that serve as a foundation for inquiry. Taught by R. Kurz, fall 2016

Tier II - LI 891: Seminar in Information Transfer (3 credit hours, letter grade)

An examination of the theoretical constructs, concepts, research and practices of the transmission and processing of symbolic, verbal, and/or recorded messages for the creation, diffusion, and utilization of knowledge in society. Taught by A. Smith, fall 2016

Tier I - LI 904 Research Strategies: Quantitative Methods and Theory (3 credit hours, letter grade) *Prerequisite: Master's level research methods course.*

This advanced course is designed for doctoral students to undertake the advanced exploration of quantitative research methodologies and statistics that the researcher might choose for various research experiences, including work on the dissertation. Rules, procedures, statistics and general research protocols are stressed as part of the researcher's tasks. The goal is for the students to master statistical and methodological tools necessary to conduct independent scholarly research. Taught by N. Luo, spring 2017

Tier II - LI 892: Seminar in Information Psychology (3 credit hours)

An exploration of theories, models, and insights into information seeking and information use offered by cognitive psychology, behavioral psychology, social psychology and psychoanalytic theory. The course is organized around a series of seminal readings in LIS; weekend activities involve lecture and discussion of central themes and articles. Taught by M. Dow, spring 2017

Qualifying Exams Offered June 2017: Information Transfer and Information Psychology

7/7 students took the Information Psychology Exam (First Reader: Dr. Mirah Dow; Second Reader, Dr. Jinzuan Ma. Date of exam: June 11 - 26, 2017 (at home, written exam)

Results: Pass, high (1 student); Pass, satisfactory (4 students); Pass, low, required rewrite (1 student); 1 student voluntarily dropped exam and program.

Attached Files

[LI892 SP 2017 Dow Student Score Data Analysis](#)

[Qualifying Exam Schedule](#)

[Alignment of Program Learning Outcomes, Program Goals, and Courses](#)

[Psy of Info Exam Rubric Form](#)

[SLIM Doctoral Program Handbook Cohort 2016](#)

[Five Fundamental Elements of Excellent Qualifying Exams](#)

[#3 Module Rubric Form](#)

[#6 Module Rubric Form](#)

[Doctor of Philosophy Program and Student Level Assessment Cycle](#)

[Doctor of Philosophy Program and Student Level Assessment Cycle](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

YEAR TWO

Continuing offering 2, 3 credit hour courses. LI905, LI893, LI890, LI894, LI940

- Teach required courses
- Based on curriculum map, all learning outcomes are aligned to the course learning outcomes. Review, revise, and/or create new course assignments and assignment evaluations.
- Align assignment rubrics with course learning outcomes
- Faculty discuss use learning outcomes and student achievement (scores of various learning objectives); determined appropriateness of choice of words/concepts stated in learning outcomes in each course as courses are taught using the approved course schedule (6 semester). Make minor revisions to wording as necessary.

Faculty begins curriculum process again with review of program goals followed by a schedule for review of course learning objectives. Assess LI900; LI903, LI891; LI904; LI892

Second Fall 2017-spring 2018, summer 2018: Offer 2, 3 credit hour courses using approved curriculum. Offer LI905; LI893; LI890; LI894. Offer LI940 in summer (2018)

Course Offering by Course Numbers, Titles, Credit Hours, Name of Teaching Professor:

Tier I - LI 905 Research Strategies: Qualitative Methods and Theory (3 credit hours, letter grade) *Prerequisite: Master's level research methods course.*

This course is intended to advance doctoral students' competence in qualitative research. The course will work through issues related to interpreting, utilizing, and (especially) the conduct of qualitative research. As such, the course will have for LIS students pragmatic (improve critical skill) and analytic (advance the notion of problem) yield. Taught by R. Rowley, fall 2017

Tier II - LI 893: Seminar in Administrative Theory (3 credit hours)

Examines a series of theories, models, and concepts that provide insight into the management of organizations, the people and tasks of an organization, and work, activities, and processes in an organization. Students analyze the literature critically, gain competence in the topics, and engage in in-depth seminar discussions. Taught by J. Muldoon, fall 2017

Tier I - LI 890 Advanced Research Strategies (3 credit hours, letter grade)

This course focuses on comparing and contrasting the philosophical foundation and research strategies of studies that use qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method approaches to investigate problems in LIS. It focuses on evaluating methodological tools and approaches to investigating research questions and evaluating LIS research studies. Taught by M. Dow, spring 2018

Tier II - LI 894: Seminar in Organization of Information (3 credit hours)

A further examination of theories, models, and aspects of organization of information, including those that provide an understanding of knowledge organization systems, the representation and organization of information in digital forms, and effective methods of information access and retrieval. The course is

Taught by S. Sutton, spring 2018

Tier IV- 940 Teaching and Learning in Organizations (3 credit hours, letter grade)

This course focuses on graduate learning/teaching, curriculum development, methods, the roles of the faculty member in the university and in the profession, as well as the structure of educational institutions for adults. Taught by – To Be Determined

Review fall 2017, spring 2018 and summer 2018. Assess LI940; LI905; LI893; LI890; LI894

Qualifying Exams to be offered Dec 2017: Administrative Theory and Information Psychology. Students must complete second

qualifying exam by the end of the second year.

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

YEAR THREE

Each student determines her/his area of concentration (Tier III) and enrolls in a total of 12 credit hours (approximately 2 semesters). Students must enroll in 800 or above level courses at ESU and some at other universities.

Faculty begin curriculum process again with review of program goals followed by schedule for review of course learning objectives. Assess LI900, LI891, LI904; LI892 (fall 2018)

Tier IV - Each student enrolls in LI946, LI947, LI950

LI 946 (A-Z) Independent Readings (1 credit hour; pass/no credit grade)

Independent reading is preparation for dissertation proposal writing. The supervising professor should be the student's dissertation chair. Students may enroll in LI 946 a maximum of three semesters; however, only one credit is a program requirement.

The purpose of independent reading is for the student to work with the dissertation chair to focus her/his research topic/problem and to be prepared for writing of the dissertation proposal (LI 947) the following semester.

Students and faculty who agree to engage in this course will submit a completed agreement form (LI 946 Agreement Form provided by director) to the doctoral program director prior to the beginning of the semester.

Upon successful completion of the qualifying examinations and selection of the dissertation chair or co-chairs, the student will enroll in LI 947 to write the proposal under the supervision of the committee chair/co-chairs. After the proposal has been presented publicly and accepted by the student's committee, SLIM dean, SLIM PhD program director, and the dean of the Graduate School, the student will advance to ABD (all but dissertation) status and will enroll in LI 950 to write the dissertation under the supervision of the committee chair/co-chairs. The dissertation must be approved by the dissertation committee, the SLIM dean, SLIM PhD program director, and the Dean of the Graduate School prior to being scheduled for public presentation. Students who wish to enroll in LI946, LI947, or LI950 in the summer may do so with permission of the professor and PhD program director.

LI947 Dissertation Proposal (3+ credit hours; pass/no credit grade)

The dissertation proposal is developed under the guidance of the committee chair/co-chairs during this course. Dissertation proposal development includes a problem statement and research questions, literature review and conceptual framework, design logic and procedures, ethical issues and IRB approval (if appropriate). A passing grade requires that the proposal is publicly presented and approved by the student's committee, SLIM Dean, and the Dean of the Graduate School. The student must pass a minimum of 3 credit hours of dissertation proposal (LI947) and be continuously enrolled (3 credit hours/semester) in the LI947 course until the proposal is publicly presented and approved.

LI 950 Dissertation (12+ credit hours; letter grade)

Students must complete at least 12 hours of dissertation credit and enroll in at least three credits each semester until the dissertation is completed or until seven years after admission to the doctoral program has expired. Dissertations are expected to contribute new knowledge to the field through high quality research. Dissertations will be supervised by a committee of at least three qualified members of the graduate faculty, one of whom must be from outside the School of Library and Information Management and may be from a different university. Students who have a concentration in Instructional Design Technology or Information Systems will have a committee member from that department; students with an approved concentration from another institute of higher education may also have a representative committee member from that discipline/institution. Upon successful completion of the dissertation and approval by the dissertation committee, SLIM dean, and the dean of the Graduate School, all students will present their research in a public forum according to the ESU Graduate School policy.

A grade of "IP" (incomplete) will be issued each semester until the dissertation is complete and approved.

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

YEAR FOUR

Review Course learning outcomes: LI940; LI903; LI891; LI904; LI892 (review in fall 2018)

Students continue to be enrolled in LI946, LI947, LI950

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

YEAR FIVE

Summarize review process

Complete course changes

Update Doctoral Handbook and other policy documents (review and revise before each new cohort begins every two years)

Begin a new assessment cycle

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Providing Department: Library and Information Management Ph.D.

Responsible Roles: Wooseob Jeong (E11097473), Mirah Dow (E10088217), Sarah Sutton (E10876844), Jim Walther (E11090740)

UNIT REPORT

Counselor Education Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/18/18, 9:07 AM

**Counselor Education Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

The Department of Counselor Education (CE) is in the process of linking syllabus reviews and course teaching observations/online course reviews to course outcomes reporting. During Fall semester 2017, CE faculty participated in both peer syllabus reviews and chair teaching observations and online course reviews. The same courses assigned for peer review were also observed, and these same courses are scheduled for course outcomes reporting this semester. These syllabus and course reviews will continue through the spring semester. The purpose of the peer reviews and teaching observations are to ensure quality and consistency in course design and pedagogy, and they are linked to the course outcomes reporting in order to keep assessment process at the forefront throughout the semester.

AY 2017

The Department of Counselor Education has completed its curriculum mapping, with Clinical Counseling and Rehabilitation Counseling undergoing an expected mapping revision this year, as RC moves from CORE to CACREP as its accreditor as of July 1. School Counseling is presently working on the KSDE report; Art Therapy has completed its 3-year alumni survey process. AT accreditation is moving from EPAB to AATA, and the program is currently completing a self-study for the AATA application process.

AY 2016

The Counselor Education department reviewed its assessment practices over the course of the academic year. The program level student learning outcomes and course curriculum was reviewed for the Rehabilitation Services RSE BS program as the curriculum mapping exercise proved beneficial.

AY 2015

The Counselor Education masters programs are guided by external accreditation standards, thus these programs engage in assessment and reporting cycles accordingly. Providing the documentation of assessments results and changes based on the findings are part of the assessment plan going forward.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

The Counselor Education Fall 2017 Peer Review Summary Report has been posted. Within it are possible strategies for syllabus and teaching reviews as outlined for the coming year. Faculty participated in course outcomes reporting at the conclusion of Fall 2017 semester.

AY 2017

The programs in the department have transitioned to the 5-Year Assessment Cycle plans with the exception of the School Counseling program which is assessed as required by the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE). The information and plans are already included in the individual program templates.

AY 2016

Establish an effective and comprehensive method of collecting and analyzing the assessment data.

Integrate assessment data into department and program goals for improving student learning. -Develop annual learning improvement strategies for each program.

Link the department learning strategies to the ESU Strategic Plan-Define success for each program and the department.

AY2015

Each of the programs within the Department of Counselor Education is guided by external accreditation standards. Each course in the department identifies the specific standards the course will address and how those standards will be assessed.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - COUNSELOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - COUNSELOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - COUNSELOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2014](#)
- [2015-2016 Program Standards](#)
- [Fall 2016 Faculty Schedule](#)
- [CE Assessment Staffing Meeting Minutes 9.21.2017](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - COUNSELOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2017](#)
- [CE Peer Review Summary Report Fall 2017](#)
- [CE Peer Review Summary Report Fall 2017.pdf](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Counselor Education - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - COUNSELOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT 2018](#)

Program Name: Art Therapy MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Art Therapy is in the process of moving from EPAB to CAAHEP as accreditor; their self-study will be completed in Fall 2017 and their first site visit will commence in Spring 2018. The program has been transitioned to the Program 5-Year Assessment Review Cycle planning.

The reports are located in the file library (AT-ESU EPAB Annual Report 2017) and the related assessment activities for AY 2018 are outlined as well.

AY 2016

The Art Therapy Counseling program within the Department of Counselor Education bases their assessment plan on the educational program standards of the AATA (American Association of Art Therapy). Each standard has been mapped to individual courses within the curriculum and then mapped to individual assessments conducted to measure student learning related to each of the standards within each course. See attached file: Art Therapy MS Assessment Program.

Attached Files

- [TTC-CE-ART THERAPY-MS](#)
- [Annual Report](#)
- [Education Standards](#)
- [Art Therapy MS - Assessment Plan 2016](#)

Program Name: Clinical Counseling MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

As of Fall 2018, CC anticipates restructuring of its degree plan core (45 credit hours) to include three 15-credit-hour concentrations: Addiction Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, and Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling. The files evidencing assessment activities and the related data files are in the file library of the Program 5-Year Assessment Review Cycle. Assessment activities for AY 2018 are strategically outlined in the plan.

AY 2016

The current editions of the CACREP *Standards*, ACA *Code of Ethics*, and the American Mental Health Counselors Association *Code of Ethics* serve as the foundation for the Assessment Plan in the Clinical Counseling program. In addition, students are also encouraged to work with program faculty to construct degree plans that meet their individualized learning outcomes.

The formal assessment of students' personal and professional development begins during the application process and continues through

graduation. The Clinical Counseling MS Assessment Plan is shown in the file repository.

Attached Files

- [Counselor Education AY 2015-2016 DATA-TABLES](#)
- [Counselor Education AY 2015-2016 APPENDICIES FINAL REPORT](#)
- [Counselor Education Final 2016 Report](#)
- [TTC-CE-CLINICAL COUNSELING-MS](#)
- [Admissions Rating Scale](#)
- [CURRICULAR EVALUATION FLOW SHEET](#)
- [VIDEO EVALUATION RUBRIC](#)
- [Clinical Counseling MS Assessment Plan 2016](#)

Program Name: Rehabilitation Counseling MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

The Rehabilitation Counseling MS program has transitioned to the Program 5-Year Assessment Review Cycle plan and as of July 1, 2017, RC moved from CORE to CACREP as its specialized accreditor. It is our understanding that the existing CORE term (2014-2022) will be honored by CACREP. The assessment strategies and activities are aligned with the requirements that we will need to apply in the accreditor transition. The annual report is included in the file library of the 5-Year Plan (CORE 3-30-2017 Annual Report).

AY 2016

The mission of Rehab Counseling MS program is to provide a comprehensive distance education program to facilitate the development of highly competent rehabilitation counselors representative of diverse cultural and disability populations, in order to effectively meet pre-employment and employment needs of individuals with disabilities. Graduates are expected to provide and coordinate all aspects of the rehabilitation process, including: assessment; individual, group, family, and vocational/career counseling; job development and placement; case management; medical, vocational, and/or educational training; follow-up services; and other rehabilitation services that will assist a person with a disability to become a contributing member of the workforce.

Attached Files

- [TTC-CE-REHABILITATION COUNSELING-MS](#)
- [Rehabilitation Counseling MS - Assessment Plan 2016](#)
- [Conference Call 7.22.15](#)
- [CORE CACREP Merger FAQ](#)

Program Name: Rehabilitation Services RSE BS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

The Rehabilitation Services RSE BS was an early adopter of the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Review Cycle planning. The second year of collecting data from assessments related to student learning outcomes in RE290 Introduction to Rehabilitation Programs is uploaded into the file library of the 5-Year plan (RSE-Assessment Report). During this academic year RE290 was approved as a General Education course, and additional data will be collected during AY2018 showing relationship to General Education goals.

Beginning in the Fall 2017 semester there will be two new, tenure-track faculty teaching in the RSE program. As a result of the new hires, a retreat for rehabilitation undergraduate faculty will be held in early fall 2017. One outcome of the retreat is an assessment plan including more of the courses in the RSE program. Therefore, the RSE program assessment report for AY2018 is anticipated to contain more robust data for the RSE program

AY 2016

The AY2016 assessment plan is summarized in Table 1 presented in the evidence file library. Overall, the majority of students taking RE290 during fall 2016 performed above or at target in relation to the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) undergraduate program standards assessed during this first year of the assessment program. However, there was consistent lower scoring on the written assignments than the objective assessments. More effort will be placed on explaining the assessment of student written work and expectations of students in their written assignments.

AY2017 will continue the assessments started in AY2016 and expand the assessment model for the RSE program to address Ethics and Professional Practices in Rehabilitation Services. RSE program graduates will demonstrate the acquisition, utilization, and evaluation of

knowledge, skills, and attitudes associated with the following: 1) Aspirational Ethics; 2) Ethical Codes; / Rule-Based Ethics; 3) Scope of Practice; 4) Malpractice; 5) Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Regulations; 6) Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) Regulations; 7) Confidentiality; 8) Responsibility; 9) Integrity; 10) Accountability; 11) Informed Consent; 12) Release of Information; 13) Client Rights; 14) Cultural Sensitivity; 15) Mandated Reporting; 16) Personal Job Seeking and Keeping Skills; 17) Techniques for Professional Self-evaluation (“walking the walk”); and 18) Professional boundaries in working relationships.

The expansion of the RSE Assessment Model will begin with conversations between RSE faculty and probable RSE adjunct faculty teaching RE305 Ethics in Human Services. These conversations will include development of assessments to the aforementioned knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to Ethics and Professional Practice. See Table 1: Summary Assessment Data - AY 2016 in evidence files.

AY 2015

The Rehabilitation Services Education program is in the very early stages of their assessment plan. To date, a course mapping exercise has been initiated (see attached document). The mapping exercise linked the RSE courses to the standards for undergraduate education published by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE). Starting in the Fall of 2015 a new faculty member will begin teaching in the RSE program and will be required to link his course objectives to the standards identified in the mapping exercise document. An example of a course that has linked the standards to course objectives is RE290 - Introduction to Rehabilitation Services. That syllabus including student learning outcomes directly related to the standards from CORE, and planned assessments will be the first course in the RSE program to gather assessment data, both objective and subjective. This course and assessment model will be replicated within each course of the undergraduate RSE program. It is anticipated the entire curriculum within RSE will be gathering relevant assessment data from each course by Spring 2017.

Attached Files

- [2016 Summary Assessment Data Table](#)
- [TTC-CE-REHABILITATION SERVICES EDUCATION-BS](#)
- [Course Mapping Grid](#)
- [RE290 Assessment Plan](#)
- [RE290 Syllabus](#)

Program Name: School Counseling MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The completion of the KSDE report in October 2017 provides useful information to inform decision-making on improving student success and the overall learning experience. The information from Section V of the report are presented here accordingly. In analyzing the data from the eight assessments we believe that the data indicate we continue to maintain a strong program for our candidates and that our candidates are ready for and able to perform well in positions as professional school counselors.

1. Historically, the expectation within the program has been that weak or poor student performance will result in remediation that continues until such time that the student can demonstrate an acceptable or target level of performance. Over the last 3 years the program has experienced a change in full-time faculty which may have resulted in some inconsistency in applying that instructional expectation across some courses, and across raters with regard to some program assessments that are related to Assessments 2, 4, 6, 8. In order to increase interrater reliability for all assessments, we are in the process of developing more detailed rubric descriptions. We will continue to reinforce and apply the program expectation that an unacceptable level of student performance should not be accepted and that remediation of student performance must continue to occur until the student demonstrates attainment of an acceptable or higher performance level on that assignment, activity, exam, or assessment.
2. When reviewing the data from the Praxis II for the past three years, we see our students scoring consistently on all subtests at or above the state and national level, although we noted lower program rubric percentage scores for Accountability for the 2016-17 school year. We will continue to monitor to determine if a trend develops.
3. In analyzing the results for Assessment 5 (Comprehensive Exam) throughout the years, there are three areas that consistently have shown about a 30% or higher rate of unacceptable responses initially on the comprehensive exam for Standard 1, Standard 2 and Standard 6. We have realized that we cover much of this content in our earlier classes, that by the end of the program, candidates seem to have forgotten much of what was taught. We have started to revisit this material and reinforce prior learning toward the end of the program as well, during Practicum, Leadership, and Internship. With some new material needing to be incorporated due to changes at the national level, we are hoping these percentages can improve. Standard 6 has consistently been a challenge for candidates, and faculty have reviewed what potential issues could be. We believe this has been due in large to the Career Development course being taught by multiple department faculty with differing counseling specializations, and that it might be important for our candidates to be sure they take the course when the School Counseling faculty teach the course so they would get the benefit of a more school focused approach to career counseling. We began advising students differently to account for this beginning in the fall semester of 2016.

4. Lesson planning processes are now incorporated into several courses (Careers, Elem/Middle, Secondary, Leadership,) with culmination and final assessment in Internship.
5. There is good indication (Assessment 3 on-site supervisor ratings) that our candidates are performing well during their internship placements. For the current three year period, there were no students performing at the unacceptable level, and 91.9 % were at the target level. We continue to have focus groups with past students who are in the field, administrators of our employed candidates, and on-site mentors/supervisors so we can be aware of any issues our candidates are having or things we need to be doing to improve the quality of our candidates. A focus group was conducted in April, 2017. The results supported the conclusion that our program completers are considered well-prepared in the knowledge and skills needed to perform the work of the counselor and demonstrate a high degree of professionalism in their work with students, teachers, and parents. We continue to use data to improve the program and the quality of our graduates.

AY 2017

The School Counseling program is the most sophisticated and historic assessment of student learning in Counselor Education. They have been gathering data relevant to CACREP, KSDE, and NCATE, now CAEP. The assessment plan is presented in the file library with an accompanying overview of assessment summary findings. Overall, the results from the data collected for the years 2011-2014 indicate that the School Counseling Program and faculty have been successful in developing candidates who have demonstrated the knowledge and skills necessary to meet or exceed each of the ten KSDE Standards for School Counselor (PreK-12). The data from the assessments designed to assess specific indicators of knowledge and content along with the assessments created to measure candidates' levels of skills and performance provide ample evidence that school counseling candidates at ESU have achieved at the "Acceptable" or "Target" levels on indicators addressing all ten of the standards required of effective professional school counselors.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 01-Data Table 1 CACREP 10-6-16](#)
- [Assessment 02 Data Table CACREP 10-06-16](#)
- [Assessment 03-Data Table for CACREP 10-06-16](#)
- [Assessment 04-Data Table CACREP 10-06-16](#)
- [Assessment 05-CACREP Data Table 10-06-16](#)
- [Assessment 06-Data Table 6 10-06-16](#)
- [Assessment 08-Data Table 8 CACREP 10-06-16](#)
- [SchoolCounselor Template2015 _NewStandards-1](#)
- [RC48 Assessment Plan Including Tables](#)
- [TTC-CE-SCHOOL COUNSELING-MS](#)
- [KSDE School Counselor Rpt 10-14 10-6-14 June 13-May 14](#)
- [Responses to Assessment Data](#)
- [Systematic Evaluation Table](#)
- [Assessment 1-Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 On-site eval Modified 010511.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Research Study on Student Learning.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Guidance Lesson Plan 11.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4-Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Comp Grading Rubric 11.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6-Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7-Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8-Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 of Counseling 11.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rating Scale for Candidate Interview with Portfolio 09.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Lesson Observation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5-Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment-Data Table.docx](#)
- [ESU SchoolCounselor 16-17 NewStandards.docx](#)
- [School Counseling Program of Study.docx](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The faculty participation in reporting their course level assessment practices was great! There was broad faculty representation across all degree programs and the course distribution was representative of all programs, as well. The faculty explanations of assignments, summary of student performance, and related findings sections were well thought out and completed by the majority of faculty. And, the change strategies employed both during the semester and for the next time the course is taught were on target. It may be beneficial to share these change strategies among faculty in a group setting, as there were some recurring themes especially those related to writing skills for research and recording session notes.

I'm looking forward to reading about how the linking of syllabus reviews and course teaching observations/online course reviews to outcomes reporting informs your decisions on curriculum and student learning improvement strategies. I like this idea of alignment and working towards the congruent student learning experiences. These types of curricular challenges (common student learning experiences) typically occur during years with faculty transitions, this alignment strategy should help to keep a consistent curriculum over time. In the course assessment reports on a few occasions, it was mentioned that change strategies were implemented based on student feedback on meeting student learning outcomes on the IDEA course evaluations. One of the ways to legitimize the IDEA student responses is to look at the employer and alumni survey results to see if the preparedness data align.

Regarding the 5-Year Assessment Cycle Plan reporting, annually for each of these programs you will want to write a summary in the 1-4 year sections and in the yearly section covering the courses assessed in the cycle years 2-4, as the year in the cycle is completed. Again, the faculty participation in assessing their courses was good, the summary will include an overview of those strategies that will be employed to improve the student learning experience, update the curriculum, etc. Basically, what decisions are being made as an outcome of your assessment practices? These summary areas were not completed this past academic year and it could be due to sabbatical leave and focusing efforts on accreditation, etc. I get it, we just need to update the summary sections with some reflective dialogue going forward.

The Art Therapy MS program has engaged in its accreditation process over this past year and the efforts of Gaelynn and program faculty were exemplary. Transitioning to a new accrediting entity is always going to take more efforts than confirming reaccreditation due to the changes and adaptations needing to be made to comply with a new set of criterion regardless of the similarities in the accrediting bodies. In reading this assessment self-study, it was apparent that the symmetry across course and program learning goals and objectives was intact and that the assessment of student learning practices were informing change strategies. The subsequent report to confirm a few of the processes should position the program for continued success and alignment with accreditation requirements. Uploading supporting documents into the file library in the 5-Year plan template is encouraged. Updating these archived files provides the evidence that ongoing assessment efforts are occurring.

As the department navigates its changes, like the Rehabilitation Counseling program becoming a concentration within the Clinical Counseling program, we can work together to get the assessment plans updated accordingly. I'm also aware that the CACREP accreditation is an ongoing challenge and is requiring resources as well. Keep up the efforts and before long it will all be worked out. Overall, the department has an advanced assessment plan for all programs, the reporting and archiving of evidence files can be a priority over this upcoming 2019 academic year. Thank you for all that you do in promoting assessment, student learning, and accreditation! Nice Job!

Academic Year 2017

The transitions to the Program 5-Year Assessment Review Cycle plans are complete for your department! Kudos to your faculty for their fine work. I have looked over each of the 5-Year plans and you have done an outstanding job of organizing your assessment activities. You have quite a few transitions going on via specialized accreditations and with the reporting for KSDE. The KSDE assessments and reporting is completed and the files are uploaded into the file library. It is very obvious that the department faculty have collaborated and extended efforts and expertise in the assessment planning, implementation, and practices this past academic year. You have went beyond the call of duty in these endeavors. Once you are fully engaged in the course level embedded assessment practices within the major curriculum courses, you will reap the rewards and benefits of having an inclusive set of data and findings that confirm your expectations for the contributions the courses make to the student learning experiences, as well as a greater understanding of how the curriculum is coupled and organized. In addition as each course is assessed and student learning improvement strategies are implemented, the levels of student and program success should incrementally improve! I sincerely appreciate all of the work of the faculty and look forward to the upcoming academic year! Thanks again for all of the efforts and expertise directed toward assessment and student learning improvement strategies!

Academic Year 2016

The Counselor Education department has made some significant progress to ensuring that assessment practices have been implemented across the multiple programs. Your first departmental goal of establishing a comprehensive method of collecting and analyzing assessment data is prevalent throughout this report at the program level. The program level reports show consistent assessment planning that aligns with external accreditation requirements and utilizes measures of course level performance, sequenced course assessments, and checkpoints to determine student learning of program level outcomes. The program level curriculum mapping exercises should benefit the department in

two ways. One, confirming the currency of the program curricula and two, to guide future assessment planning relating to developing annual learning improvement strategies at the program level. As you approach the upcoming academic year, use the curriculum map to narrow assessment strategies. As faculty work through the mapping process, oftentimes findings can inform next steps for assessment plans. You will want to gather program faculty to decide where assessment efforts should be focused for this upcoming year. It may be related to assessing a capstone course or major project or thesis, depending on the program. The capstone course, major project or thesis, by design exemplify the accumulation of student learning across program outcomes. Findings from these student works can inform improving student learning in lower level courses mapped to specific program outcomes. These course level assessments can be incorporated into multiple year assessment plans. Narrowing assessment focus and intentionally setting goals to improve student learning has a positive impact on both student and program successes. The structure of the external accreditation requirements often leave little time to look at course level outcomes, thus the strategy to be specific in what you do while keeping the workload manageable. Choose one area that all program faculty want to improve and go after it, and make the improvement happen. This is good work give the faculty kudos!

Academic Year 2015

The assessment plan for the Counselor Education department is in some transition due to changes by external accrediting bodies. It is acknowledged that the Art Therapy program and those under the direction of the Kansas Department of Education and CAEP are undergoing some changes that will affect assessment design and approach. Good progress has been made on the curriculum maps and I'm encouraged to see how the Rehabilitation Services RSE BS comes together. The syllabus and the RC290 curriculum map were great examples of the structure being built for the program. Be sure to include evidence files for the work that gets completed in the upcoming year including curriculum maps and assessment results for any of the metrics you measure. I took the privilege of copying the Summary and Interpretation of Data Results from the KSDE report for the School Counseling MS program and placed it in the program summary area. Sharing these results provides the reader with knowledge of the changes (closing the loop) that occurred as a result of the assessment practices. The assessment structures you have built are sound and based on insuring that students are learning the content, skills, and values of the counseling professions. The rewards for building from the ground up with intentional steps for making sure that all learning points are covered is huge. You may have designed assessments for everything you do, but remember to keep it manageable for faculty. Let them decide on those areas that are felt to be opportunities for improvement. Staying abreast of the counseling examination requirements on standardized tests will dictate quite a bit of your curricula changes, so faculty will also be tasked with implementing these changes. Be sure to share the Baseline survey tool to collect data from students, alumni, employers, and intern supervisors, it is convenient, easy to use and has good technical support. I'll provide training as needed. For the upcoming year, the department has lofty goals and you should be able to have your assessment structures in place for all programs if you continue efforts and the external accrediting bodies complete their processes of redefining standards, etc. You have been methodical in this years efforts and made some really good progress, keep up the good work.

Attached Files

- [2017 CACREP Mid-Cycle Report - \(Body ONLY\) PDF](#)
- [Appendix D Applicant Rating Rehabilitaiton Counseling](#)
- [Appendix D Applicant Rating School Counseling](#)
- [Appendix E CCS-r Clinical & Rehabilitation Counseling](#)
- [Appendix E Dispositional Review School Counseling](#)
- [Appendix E Personal Development Contract Clinical & Rehabilitation Counseling](#)
- [Appendix F Program Evaluation 2015 Clinical Counseling](#)
- [Appendix B Syllabus CE 810 Pre-Practicum](#)
- [Appendix C Recruitment Clinical Counseling](#)
- [Appendix C Recruitment Rehabilitation Counseling](#)
- [Appendix C Recruitment School Counseling](#)
- [Appendix C Rehabilitation Counseling Flyer](#)
- [Appendix D Applicant Rating Clinical Counseling](#)
- [Appendix A 2017.DennisCV](#)
- [Appendix A 2017.KesslerCV](#)
- [Appendix A 2017.ShaughnessyCV](#)
- [Appendix B Syallbus SC 871 SC Practicum](#)
- [Appendix B Syllabus CE 735 Co-Occurring Disorders](#)
- [Appendix B Syllabus CE 804 Clinical Supervision](#)

Providing Department: Counselor Education

Responsible Roles:

(null), Damara Paris (E10904248), Gaelynn Wolf Bordonaro (E10087743), Robert Kircher (E10230873), James Costello (E10087827), Alice Hinck (E10001643), Melissa Briggs (E10746227), Joan Brewer (E10000569), Ceara Shaughnessy (E10804304), Katrina Miller (E10329067)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1****Art Therapy MS**

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Course to be assessed:

- AT 835 Art Therapy Internship

SUMMARY 2018

NOTE: Art Therapy is in the process of moving from EPAB to CAAHEP as accreditor; their self-study will be completed in Fall 2017 and their first site visit will commence in Spring 2018.

Attached Files

- [AT - ESU EPAB Annual Report 2017](#)
- [TTC-CE-ART THERAPY-MS](#)
- [Schmanke-Libby-AT802-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Stallings-Jessie-AT812-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Schmanke-Libby-AT801-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Stallings-Jessie-AT812-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Stallings-Jessie-AT849-SP18.pdf](#)
- [All Art Therapy Major Assessment Reports Combined-AY18.pdf](#)
- [Wolf-Bordonaro-Gaelynn-AT708-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wolf-Bordonaro-Gaelynn-AT835-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wolf-Bordonaro-Gaelynn-AT849-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wolf-Bordonaro-Gaelynn-AT850-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wolf-Bordonaro-Gaelynn-AT804-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- AT 708 Art Media & Material Use in Art Therapy
- AT 800 Art Therapy Foundations

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- AT 804 Advanced Art Therapy Assess & Tech in Families/Rel
-
- AT 801 Art Therapy Group Dynamics & Special Populations
- AT 802 Development & Treatment Models in Art Therapy

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

-
- AT 810 Introduction to Art Therapy Research
- AT 812 Applied Art Therapy Research
- AT 849 Masters Project

- AT 850 Masters Thesis

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Art Therapy MS

Responsible Roles: Gaelynn Wolf Bordonaro (E10087743), Katrina Miller (E10329067)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Clinical Counseling MS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Course to be assessed:

- CE 899 Internship in Clinical Counseling (6)

SUMMARY 2018

As of Fall 2018, CC anticipates restructuring of its degree plan core (45 credit hours) to include three 15-credit-hour concentrations: Addiction Counseling, Clinical Mental Health Counseling, and Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling.

Attached Files

- [TTC-CE-CLINICAL COUNSELING-MS](#)
- [Table 13-Completion of Internship](#)
- [Table 14-Final-Faculty-Evaluation](#)
- [Table 15-ESU-NCE Results](#)
- [Table 1-Degree Candidacy](#)
- [Table 2-Faculty Evaluation-IDEA](#)
- [Table 3-Admissions](#)
- [Table 4-Supervisory Satisfaction Scale](#)
- [Table 5-Practicum Interview](#)
- [Table 6-Professional Identity Scale](#)
- [Table 7-Completion of Practicum](#)
- [Table 8-CCS-Faculty Evaluation](#)
- [Table 9-CCS.StudentSelfEval](#)
- [Table 10-VideoEvaluationRubric](#)
- [Table 11-Case.Conceptualization.Rubric](#)
- [Table 12-Comprehensive Exams](#)
- [ESU-ASSESSMENT REPORT-AY17-FINAL](#)
- [Briggs-Melissa-CE810-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Briggs-Melissa-CE810-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Briggs-Melissa-CE830-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Dennis-Brittany-CE893-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hinck-Alice-CE801-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Dennis-Brittany-CE899-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hinck-Alice-CE820-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Kessler-Basil-CE810-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Paris-Damara-CE826-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Shaughnessy-Ceara-CE898-FA18.pdf](#)
- [Shaughnessy-Ceara-CE898-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Shaughnessy-Ceara-CE899-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Stallings-Jessie-CE708-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

The following courses will be assessed during this cycle:

- CE 708 Multicultural Issues in Counseling & Related Fields (3)

- CE 802 Foundations of Professional Counseling (3)
- CE 810 Pre-Practicum: Counseling Skills Development (2)
- CE 893 Ethical Issues in Counseling & Related Fields (3)

SUMMARY YEAR 2

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- CE 735 Co-Occurring Disorders
- CE 825 Counseling Theories (3)
- CE 830 Group Processes in Counseling (3)
- MH 770 Relationship & Family Counseling (3)

SUMMARY YEAR 3

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- CE 801 Crisis Counseling (3)
- CE 833 Diagnosis & Treatment of Mental Disorders (3)
- CE 835 Individual & Group Appraisal (3)
- CE 898 Practicum in Clinical Counseling (3)

SUMMARY YEAR 4

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Clinical Counseling MS

Responsible Roles: Katrina Miller (E10329067)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Rehabilitation Counseling MS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Course to be assessed:

- RE 899 Internship in Rehabilitation Counseling (6)

As of July 1, 2017, RC moved from CORE to CACREP as accreditor. It is our understanding that the existing CORE term (2014-2022) will be honored by CACREP.

RC is included in the CACREP Mid-Cycle Review, due September 1, 2017.

SUMMARY 2018

As of Fall 2018, RC is expecting to begin the process of closing the program and moving under Clinical Counseling as a 15-credit-hour concentration: Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling.

Due to this anticipated change, the only courses that will be assessed are courses that are unique to Rehabilitation Counseling students' plan of study. The Rehabilitation Counseling courses that are common to all counseling programs in Counselor Education will be assessed within other programs.

Courses specific to Rehabilitation Counseling which will be assessed are as follows:

- RE 692 Vocational Information & Assessment (year 2)
- RE 695 Employment Issues in Rehabilitation (year 2)

- RE 730 Medical Aspects of Disability (year 3)
- RE 732 Psychosocial Development & Disability (year 3)
- RE 751 Advanced Case Management (year 4)
- RE 855 Practicum in Rehabilitation Counseling (year 4)
- RE 899 Internship in Rehabilitation Counseling (capstone)

Attached Files

- [CORE 3-30-2017 Annual Report](#)
- [TTC-CE-REHABILITATION COUNSELING-MS](#)
- [RC Focus Group 2016](#)
- [Costello-James-RE699-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Costello-James-RE700-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Costello-James-RE855-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Costello-James-RE899-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Hardin-Paul-RE692-FA17.pdf](#)
- [McEchron-Michael-RE683-SP18.pdf](#)
- [McEchron-Michael-RE695-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Shaughnessy-Ceara-RE746-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Wolf-Bordonaro-Gaelynn-RE720-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Schmanke-Libby-RE670-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- RE 692 Vocational Information & Assessment (3)
- RE 695 Employment Issues in Rehabilitation (3)

SUMMARY YEAR 2

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- RE 730 Medical Aspects of Disability (3)
- RE 732 Psychosocial Development & Disability (3)

SUMMARY 3

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Course to be assessed:

- RE 751 Advanced Case Management (3)
- RE 855 Practicum in Rehabilitation Counseling (3)

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Rehab Counseling MS

Responsible Roles: Katrina Miller (E10329067)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Rehabilitation Services Education RSE BS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2025

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Course to be assessed:

- RE 699 Internship in RSE
- RE 700 RSE Seminar

The second year of collecting data from assessments related to student learning outcomes in RE290 Introduction to Rehabilitation

Programs is attached. During this academic year RE290 was approved as a General Education course, and additional data will be collected during AY2018 showing relationship to General Education goals.

Beginning in the Fall 2017 semester there will be two new, tenure-track faculty teaching in the RSE program. As a result of the new hires, a retreat for rehabilitation undergraduate faculty will be held in early fall 2017. One outcome of the retreat is an assessment plan including more of the courses in the RSE program. Therefore, the RSE program assessment report for AY2018 is anticipated to contain more robust data for the RSE program

Attached Files

[RSE-ASSESSMENT REPORT](#)

[TTC-CE-REHABILITATION SERVICES EDUCATION-BS](#)

[McEchron-Michael-RE291-SP18.pdf](#)

[McEchron-Michael-RE392-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- RE 290 Introduction to Rehabilitation Services
- RE 291 Survey of Disabling Conditions
- RE 301 Research & Report Writing
- RE 305 Ethics in Human Services

The Fall 2017 RSE Faculty retreat will focus on developing an expanded assessment plan representing more required courses within the RSE program. To do this, faculty will review the attached files to determine relevant student learning outcomes to assess, and from what courses.

Also, an overall RSE curricular review will evaluate the degree to which the RSE-SLOs are related to Blooms Taxonomy of Learning. RSE graduates are expected to demonstrate an entry-level skill set and therefore must be able to apply the knowledge and skills they have gained in the program. The SLO relationship to the taxonomy will provided a guideline for assessment practices and program development needs. Finally, the courses in the RSE program have been compared to the standards of the CORE (Council on Rehabilitation Education) undergraduate program standards. Although CORE no longer offers the undergraduate rehabilitation program accreditation, the standards are the most comprehensive collection of relevant standards related to entry level human services employment.

Attached Files

[RSE-CORE.UG-STANDARDS](#)

[RSE.SLO.BLOOMS-TABLE](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- RE 392 Survey of Mental & Psychological Disabilities
- RE 510 Helping Relationships
- RE 636 Introduction to Group Procedures

Year Three, Four, and Five will build on the outcomes of the RSE faculty retreat, assessment plan, collected data, results of the data analysis and impact of results on student learning.

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Courses to be assessed:

- RE 641 Caseload Management
- RE 670 Alcohol & Drug Abuse in Counseling
- RE 683 Family Issues & Advocacy

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Rehabilitation Services RSE BS

Responsible Roles: James Costello (E10087827), Katrina Miller (E10329067)

UNIT REPORT

**Elementary Education, Early Childhood & Special Education
Assessment Report 2018**

Generated: 10/18/18, 11:52 AM

**Elementary Education, Early Childhood, and Special Education Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2015-2018**

Annual Assessment Plans are designed to incorporate the Teachers College Conceptual Framework and are aligned with multiple accrediting and professional standards such as Kansas Department of Education and CAEP standards. These department level assessment plans do not vary on an annual basis, but rather are adapted as external accrediting entities change directions and expectations.

The Teachers College Conceptual Framework reflects the philosophy that for educators to help all students learn, they must have a command of content, critical ideas and skills, and the capacity to reflect on, evaluate, and learn from their practice so that it continually improves. The candidate preparing for a career in education is immersed in an academic milieu that values a number of tenets the faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of teachers, other school personnel, and others in the helping professions: especially, the value of diversity; the relevance of authentic assessment; the essentials of professionalism; the importance of collaboration; the value of leadership; the significance of access to information; the usefulness of appropriate technology, and the power of reflection. ESU's professional education programs offered through The Teachers College are devoted to the proposition that candidates who learn and grow in such an atmosphere and who integrate knowledge, theory, and practice begin their professional lives as professional educators.

The unit embraces the idea that while successful professional educators can be highly effective in different ways, common proficiencies draw on shared understanding of how to foster student learning. The Conceptual Framework identifies six proficiencies resulting from this shared understanding. The candidate who is competent in these proficiencies becomes The Professional. Specifically, the Professional provides service to society, applies interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, engages in effective practice, responds to uncertainty and change, relies on self-reflection, and belongs to a professional community. In the elementary teacher preparation program, ensuring that our teachers are prepared to provide the children of the nation with foundational knowledge and skills provides service to society. In the Teacher Work Sample, candidates are required to demonstrate their ability to apply interdisciplinary knowledge (Factor 4); and to reflect on the performance of their students and what the candidates would do better/differently the next time they teach the lesson (Factor 7). Candidates observe and model public school and university faculties involvement with professional organizations, coming to recognize the importance of the professional community. Interns belong to Professional Learning Communities with their mentor teachers during their Professional Development School experience.

The unit's professional programs are designed to reflect current knowledge bases and effective practices. Curricular coherence is strengthened through faculty study and dialogue on purpose, course content, and intended candidate learning outcomes. Educational philosophy, research in teaching, wisdom of exemplary practice in model schools research, state licensure requirements, contributions of learned societies and professional organizations, advisory councils, and an outgrowth of faculty development activities all undergird the conceptual framework. In addition, the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Principles, the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and the initial program and professional standards of the KSBE were considered and incorporated into the conceptual framework.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2015-2018**

The Department Chair and the Associate Chair worked with all programs to provide the Provost Office with HLC requested with all requested documentations and faculty qualifications protocols for FY 18. The Department Chair worked with USS to create and update the Departments website to provide HLC process approved Curriculum Vitae by each department faculty members BIO on the website. This aligns with the newly adopted HLC process and supports the HLC initiative.

1. Describe the specific improvement strategy. What are you going to do?
 1. A Department Leadership Committee (DLC) balanced the department's needs and growth through a shared governance model. The DLC is made up of undergraduate, graduate, and advising program representatives. DLC is run by the Associate Department Chair through guidance from the Department Chair. DLC met monthly to discuss action items as well as information for the greater good of the EE/ECU/Sped academic department.
2. Identify what will be used to assess the strategy's success.
 1. Meeting notes are kept and archived.
 2. DLC works as a group to position programs for growth.
 3. DLC worked with the HLC requests to help the large programs and departments transitions to meet HLC needs and requests.
 4. DLC representatives will analyze and discuss the most recent Focus Group Report from AY15 - AY 18 (FY 18). The Report and the data results are attached.
3. Identify what the success levels are and what is acceptable performance.
 1. Growth through a newly formed program coordinator committee. Meeting to discuss changes and needs to position the department for growth.
 2. Opportunities for student data analysis and program analysis. Piloting a new Full - Time/Half - Time Graduate Program Adviser. Working with the new Full - Time/Half - Time Graduate Program Adviser to create a consistent advising "Unified Advising Model".
4. Describe how the success of this strategy will improve the overall effectiveness of student learning.
 1. All programs and student data within those programs were analyzed each semester by the departments DLC.
 2. DLC representatives worked to provide feedback to the program faculty about the need for updated students assessment, student learning outcome requirements, updated goals in syllabi, and ongoing student assessment protocols.

AY 18

Based on Assessment Data identify key areas for assessing improvement strategies.

1. Describe the specific improvement strategy. What are you going to do?
 - a. A Department Leadership Committee (DLC) will be formed to help balance the department's needs and growth through a shared governance model. The DLC will be made up of undergraduate, graduate, and advising program representatives. DLC will be run by the Associate Chair through guidance from the Department Chair. DLC will meet monthly to discuss action items as well as information for the greater good of the EE/ECU/Sped academic department. Identify what will be used to assess the strategy's success.
 - a. Meeting notes will be kept and archived.
 - b. DLC will work as a group to position programs for growth.
2. Identify what the success levels are and what is acceptable performance.
 - a. Growth through a newly formed program coordinator committee.
 - b. Opportunities for student data analysis and program analysis.
3. Describe how the success of this strategy will improve the overall effectiveness of student learning.
 1. All programs and student data within those programs will be analyzed each semester by the departments DLC.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - ELEM ED-EARLY CHILDHD-SPEC ED 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ELEM ED-EARLY CHILDHD-SPEC ED 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ELEM ED-EARLY CHILDHD-SPEC ED 2014](#)
- [Focus Group Report Analysis](#)
- [Responses_All_160315\[1\]](#)
- [Graphs](#)
- [EL-ED_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ELEM ED-EARLY CHILDHD-SPEC ED 2017](#)
- [DLC Example Agenda](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Elementary Education-Early Childhood-Special Ed-AY2018.pdf](#)
- [All ELED Department Assessment Reports Combined-AY18.pdf](#)
- [Ezell-Sonja-CD832-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Liss-Jerald-SD709-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Metzger-Stephanie-EL310-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Ezell-Sonja-CD838-SP18.pdf](#)

- [Liss-Jerald-SD809-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Kemp-Peggy-CD841-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Phelps-Connie-SD851-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Phelps-Connie-SD856-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Phelps-Connie-SD855-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Phelps-Connie-SD857-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Phelps-Connie-SD858-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Phelps-Connie-SD864-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Shoemaker-Kylea-SD560-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - ELEM ED-EARLY CHILHD-SPEC ED 2018](#)

Program Name : Early Childhood Unified: Birth to 8

Summary of Program Assessments:

Early Childhood Unified Masters and Licensure Programs

Early Childhood Unified: Birth to 8: AY17

Program Overview

The graduate program in Early Childhood Unified is designed to prepare:

- teachers to work effectively with young children in early childhood settings that are inclusive or non-inclusive
- teachers working with young children in early childhood special education settings
- teachers to meet the challenges of the present and the future

Current federal mandates and trends in public schools recognize the growing importance of early childhood special education services for children from birth through age eight and their families. Teachers with advanced training in their field will be in a favored position to usher in best practices for young children.

There is an emphasis on early intervention and serving families with infants with special needs. The Master of Science degree in Early Childhood Education may result in the Kansas License ECU Birth through age eight or the Kansas License ECU Birth to Kindergarten.

Licensure

The program offers a master's of science degree in Early Childhood Unified. The candidate must have a degree in elementary education as an admission requirement for the Early Childhood Unified program for Birth through age eight license in Kansas. The Early Childhood Unified program for Kansas License Birth to Kindergarten does not require a degree in elementary education as an admission requirement but does require a degree in a related field. [Learn more about the licensure programs.](#)

Admission Requirements

All candidates are admitted on a probationary status, pending successful completion of these admission requirements:

Step 1 - Graduate School Admissions

- GPA (a minimum of 3.00 on last 60 undergraduate hours);
- apply and be admitted to [Emporia State's Graduate School](#);

Step 2 - Enroll in CD 730 (first Early Childhood Unified course in the sequence of the program). If taking a second course, contact the program coordinator for advice.

Step 3 - ECU Program Admissions Requirements: these must be completed during the first semester while enrolled in CD 730:

- Two references from supervisors, former supervisors, or co-workers.
- Two [Advanced Candidate Assessment of Dispositions](#) completed by supervising administrators (this can be done by the same individuals who filled out the reference forms for the item above).
- Signed [Advanced Candidate Assessment of Dispositions Agreement Form](#).
- Complete an ECU Admissions Essay; to see what areas your essay should address and how it will be scored, see ECU Admissions Essay Rubric and Instructions.

Admission points are assigned on each of the above elements. The stronger the performance, the greater the number of points assigned.

Admission points are totaled and admission is determined by a department graduate committee.

All materials are due February 15 for summer enrollment, June 1 for fall enrollment or September 1 for spring enrollment.

Degree Candidacy

Candidacy is the formal approval for pursuit of a graduate degree after it is determined that all specified preliminary requirements have been met. Requirements for degree candidacy are as follows:

1. The candidate must have met the admission requirements.
2. The advisor must have filed the candidate's degree plan with the Graduate School.
3. The candidate must have completed at least six hours of course work on the graduate program.
4. When all steps above are completed, the advisor will inform the Graduate School, and the candidate will be removed from probation.

Clinical Experiences

There are two Clinical Experiences in the Early Childhood Unified Graduate Program:

CD 841: Center-Based Clinical Experience

CD 861: Home Based Clinical Experience

Each Clinical Experience requires completion of 150 clock hours in an approved center-based program (CD 841) or home-based program (CD 861) over a period of at least five weeks.

Permission to Participate in the Clinical Experiences

Even though students are admitted to degree candidacy, enrollment in the two clinical experiences required in this program is not automatic. Permission from the instructor is required for enrollment in the two clinical experiences. Candidates will be evaluated on knowledge, skills and dispositions required for success in the two clinical experiences, CD 841 and CD 861. Students will be given a copy of the dispositions rating form after acceptance into the program. If a student does not meet expectations, he/she will not be allowed to enroll in the Clinical Experiences.

Early Childhood Unified Masters and Licensure Programs

Early Childhood Unified: Birth to 8: AY17

Program Overview

The graduate program in Early Childhood Unified is designed to prepare:

- teachers to work effectively with young children in early childhood settings that are inclusive or non-inclusive
- teachers working with young children in early childhood special education settings
- teachers to meet the challenges of the present and the future

Current federal mandates and trends in public schools recognize the growing importance of early childhood special education services for children from birth through age eight and their families. Teachers with advanced training in their field will be in a favored position to usher in best practices for young children.

There is an emphasis on early intervention and serving families with infants with special needs. The Master of Science degree in Early Childhood Education may result in the Kansas License ECU Birth through age eight.

Licensure

The program offers a master's of science degree in Early Childhood Unified. The candidate must have a degree in elementary education as an admission requirement for the Early Childhood Unified program for Birth through age eight license in Kansas. The Early Childhood Unified program for Kansas License Birth to Kindergarten does not require a degree in elementary education as an admission requirement but does require a degree in a related field. [Learn more about the licensure programs.](#)

Admission Requirements

All candidates are admitted on a probationary status, pending successful completion of these admission requirements:

Step 1 - Graduate School Admissions

- GPA (a minimum of 3.00 on last 60 undergraduate hours);
- apply and be admitted to [Emporia State's Graduate School](#);

Step 2 - ECU Program Admissions Requirements:

- Two references from supervisors, former supervisors, or co-workers. [Please use the forms provided here.](#)
- Two [Advanced Candidate Assessment of Dispositions](#) completed by supervising administrators (this can be done by the same individuals who filled out the reference forms for the item above).
- Signed [Advanced Candidate Assessment of Dispositions Agreement Form](#).
- Complete an ECU Admissions Essay; to see what areas your essay should address and how it will be scored, see [ECU Admissions Essay Rubric and Instructions here](#).

Step 3 - Enroll in CD 730 (first Early Childhood Unified course in the sequence of the program). If taking a second course, contact the program coordinator for advice.

Admission points are assigned on each of the above elements. The stronger the performance, the greater the number of points assigned. Admission points are totaled and admission is determined by a department graduate committee.

All materials are due February 15 for summer enrollment, June 1 for fall enrollment or September 1 for spring enrollment.

Degree Candidacy

Candidacy is the formal approval for pursuit of a graduate degree after it is determined that all specified preliminary requirements have been met. Requirements for degree candidacy are as follows:

1. The candidate must have met the admission requirements.
2. The advisor must have filed the candidate's degree plan with the Graduate School.
3. The candidate must have completed at least six hours of coursework on the graduate
4. program.
5. When all steps above are completed, the advisor will inform the Graduate School, and the candidate will be removed from probation.

Clinical Experiences

There are two Clinical Experiences in the Early Childhood Unified Graduate Program:

CD 841: Center-Based Clinical Experience

CD 861: Home Based Clinical Experience

Each Clinical Experience requires completion of 150 clock hours in an approved center-based program (CD 841) or home-based program (CD 861) over a period of at least five weeks.

Permission to Participate in the Clinical Experiences

Even though students are admitted to degree candidacy, enrollment in the two clinical experiences required in this program is not automatic. Following approval of agreement and approval forms the university supervisor enrolls candidates in the clinical experiences. Candidates will be evaluated on knowledge, skills and dispositions required for success in the two clinical experiences, CD 841 and CD 861. Students will be given a copy of the dispositions rating form after acceptance into the program. If a student does not meet expectations, he/she will not be allowed to enroll in the Clinical Experiences.

Graduation Requirements

In order to receive a master's degree in early childhood education, candidates must accomplish the following:

1. Complete the program of study outlined below.
2. A grade of B or better must be earned in all courses required by the Early Childhood Unified programs. This includes prerequisite courses, in order to move forward in the program.
3. Maintain at least 3.00 overall grade point average.
4. Demonstrate dispositions of professional/ethical standards throughout the program.
5. Complete a series of three capstone credits outlined in the candidate's degree plan.

Improvements Based on Assessment Data identify key areas for assessing improvement strategies

1. Describe the specific improvement strategy. What are you going to do?

1. **Accelerated Masters** – In order to increase enrollment and better prepare ECU Professionals, proposing ECU Accelerated Masters for Birth to 8 candidates.
2. **Capstone Series** – As of Fall 2015, the ECU program began transitioning to a Capstone requirement to replace the Comprehensive Exam requirement. At this time candidates take a series of three credit hours throughout their degree completion. CD 831, CD 835, CD 844. These courses have prerequisites and are designated to be taken with specific courses. See below program of study.
3. **First Agreement with school district** - Agreement with USD 480 in Liberal, KS - USD 480/ECU MOU's will be developed and agreed upon to help USD 480 prepare qualified ECU teachers in their district.
4. **Year long experience with families** - Due to lower scores in Family & Community section of Praxis test - CD 842/843 – link with same family for the academic year, and connect with Part C agency during the year prior to the summer CD 861 infant/toddler practicum.
5. **Added Portfolio** - In 2012, Early Childhood Faculty has added an 8th assessment: Validation of Inclusive Elementary Teaching Portfolio to measure more thoroughly the candidates' knowledge of adapting planning and curriculum for exceptional students in the primary grades K-3. Due to the addition of more family centered validation, the course was increased by 1 credit, so was changed to a 3 credit course. CD 839 services as the Validation of Inclusion Elementary Teaching Portfolio requirement.
6. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** - The Early Childhood Faculty has also completed several course title and number changes which more closely reflect the inclusive nature of most groups of young children in the field and the "unified" nature of the Kansas license.
7. **Maintain contact with clinical experience mentors** - Maintain contact with, and input from, mentors for practica CD 841 & CD 861 - In addition to these formal assessments, the Early Childhood Faculty maintain contact with the mentors throughout the state who guide and cooperate with our candidates. Every three years we assemble a focus group made up of employers and others in the field to request candid reflections on the quality of our candidates.
8. **Focus Groups** - We continue to conduct a focus group for review of program. Last one was Spring of 2013. Due to a faculty members sabbatical, the ECU program requested to postpone scheduled focus group. The ECU faculty are currently implementing a focus group study, Spring of 2017.

2. Identify what will be used to assess the strategy's success.

1. **Accelerated Masters** – pass through all of ESU's curricular changes and program approval levels.
2. **Capstone Series** – This Capstone Series, beginning Fall 2015 replaced both EL 751 coursework and our traditional comprehensive exam requirement.
3. **First Agreement with school district** - Completed, documented, and signed MOU's. Agreement must pass through all of the University levels, including University council; in addition to USD 253 approval and signatures.

4. **Year long experience with families** – observe any improvement in Praxis scores in the Family & Community section
5. **Added Portfolio** – Candidates receive critical feedback throughout the completion of the portfolio, yet expected to make revisions independently. Candidates must receive a passing score on the final portfolio as well as an 83% or higher in the CD 839 course.
6. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** – check for better understanding from individuals inquiring and new students
7. **Maintain contact with clinical experience mentors** – informal feedback and mentors willing to continue to mentor future Candidates
8. **Focus Groups** – Currently being implemented Spring 2017.

3. Identify what the success levels are and what is acceptable performance.

1. **Accelerated Masters** – Recruitment and growth from new program
2. **Capstone Series** – Capstone Series courses will receive a grade. We expect candidates to receive a 83% or higher in each one credit hour course.
3. **First Agreement with school district** - Growth through a newly formed partnership.
4. **Year long experience with families** – Increased experience and skills for professional working with infants/toddlers and families
5. **Added Portfolio** – Candidates receive critical feedback throughout the completion of the portfolio, yet expected to make revisions independently. Candidates must receive a passing score on the final portfolio as well as an 83% or higher in the CD 839 course.
6. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** – check for better understanding from individuals inquiring and new students
7. **Maintain contact with practicum mentors** – consistency with some practicum mentors if parts of the state
8. **Focus Groups** – feedback for strengthening program

4. Describe how the success of this strategy will improve the overall effectiveness of student learning.

1. **Accelerated Masters** – An Accelerated Masters maintained and serve as a way to identify majors earlier coming into the field of Elementary Education. This new Masters Degree is fully implemented and has new students enrolled in it.
2. **Capstone Series** – By completing this capstone requirement throughout the program completion, candidates should demonstrate a deeper understanding of application of both developmental theory and advocacy for the needs of the families and children they work with. Candidates develop a stronger professional philosophy and in return advocate for the needs of their families and children.
3. **First Agreement with school district** - Growth through a newly formed partnership. MOU that can be analyzed for the greater good of future partnerships with ESU's ECU
4. **Year long experience with families** – Increased experience and skills for professionals working with infants/toddlers and families
5. **Added Portfolio** – The portfolio requirement is an additional means to document the application of the ECU program philosophy, pedagogy, and advocacy candidates demonstrate in a birth to age 8 educational setting.
6. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** – check for better understanding from individuals inquiring and new students
7. **Maintain contact with clinical experience mentors** – consistency with some mentors if parts of the state. By using graduated candidates as mentors, these mentors will have a strong understanding of program philosophy, pedagogy, and infrastructure.
8. **Focus Groups** – feedback for strengthening program

Attached Files

- [ECU B - K KSDE Report 2015](#)
- [Birth8DataTables2015](#)
- [Birth to Grade 3 KSDE 2015](#)
- [TTC-ES-EARLY CHILDHOOD UNIFIED B-3-MS](#)

[TTC-ES-EARLY CHILDHOOD UNIFIED ACCELERATED MASTERS-MS](#)

[ECUB82017KSDEReport](#)

[ECU \(B-8\) Degree Plan \(Licensure\)](#)

[Report Grade 3](#)

[ECU \(B-8\) Degree Plan \(Licensure\).doc](#)

[ECUB82017KSDEReportFinal.docx](#)

[ECU \(B-8\) Degree Plan \(Licensure\).doc](#)

[Assessment1aDataTable.docx](#)

[ECUB82017KSDEReportFinal.docx](#)

[Assessment2Data Tables.docx](#)

[Assessment3Data Tables.docx](#)

[Assessment4Data Tables.docx](#)

[Assessment5Data Tables.docx](#)

[Assessment6Data Tables.docx](#)

[Assessment8Data Tables.docx](#)

[Assessment7Data Tables.docx](#)

[Assessment2CD839Rubric.docx](#)

[Assessment2CD839SectionIII.docx](#)

[Assessment3CD841Rubric.docx](#)

[Assessment4CD861ObservationLead.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD730CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD832CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD838CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD839CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD841CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD843CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD844CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment5CD861CourseGrade.docx](#)

[Assessment6CD835ActionPlan.docx](#)

[Assessment7CD842FamilyProject.docx](#)

[Assessment8CD737FinalProject.docx](#)

Program Name : Early Childhood Unified: Birth – K

Summary of Program Assessments:

Early Childhood Unified Masters and Licensure Programs

Early Childhood Unified: Birth – K: AY17

Program Overview

The graduate program in Early Childhood Unified is designed to prepare:

- teachers to work effectively with young children in early childhood settings that are inclusive or non-inclusive
- teachers working with young children in early childhood special education settings
- teachers to meet the challenges of the present and the future

Current federal mandates and trends in public schools recognize the growing importance of early childhood special education services for children from birth through age eight and their families. Teachers with advanced training in their field will be in a favored position to usher in best practices for young children.

There is an emphasis on early intervention and serving families with infants with special needs. The Master of Science degree in Early Childhood Education may result in the Kansas License ECU Birth to Kindergarten.

Licensure

The program offers a master's of science degree in Early Childhood Unified. The candidate must have a degree in elementary education as an

admission requirement for the Early Childhood Unified program for Birth through age eight license in Kansas. The Early Childhood Unified program for Kansas License Birth to Kindergarten does not require a degree in elementary education as an admission requirement but does require a degree in a related field. [Learn more about the licensure programs.](#)

All candidates are admitted on a probationary status, pending successful completion of these admission requirements:

Step 1 - Graduate School Admissions

- GPA (a minimum of 3.00 on last 60 undergraduate hours);
- apply and be admitted to [Emporia State's Graduate School](#);

Step 2 - ECU Program Admissions Requirements:

- Two references from supervisors, former supervisors, or co-workers. [Please use the forms provided here.](#)
- Two [Advanced Candidate Assessment of Dispositions](#) completed by supervising administrators (this can be done by the same individuals who filled out the reference forms for the item above).
- Signed [Advanced Candidate Assessment of Dispositions Agreement Form](#).
- Complete an ECU Admissions Essay; to see what areas your essay should address and how it will be scored, see [ECU Admissions Essay Rubric and Instructions here](#).

Step 3 - Enroll in CD 730 (first Early Childhood Unified course in the sequence of the program). If taking a second course, contact the program coordinator for advice.

Admission points are assigned on each of the above elements. The stronger the performance, the greater the number of points assigned. Admission points are totaled and admission is determined by a department graduate committee.

All materials are due February 15 for summer enrollment, June 1 for fall enrollment or September 1 for spring enrollment.

Degree Candidacy

Candidacy is the formal approval for pursuit of a graduate degree after it is determined that all specified preliminary requirements have been met. Requirements for degree candidacy are as follows:

1. The candidate must have met the admission requirements.
2. The advisor must have filed the candidate's degree plan with the Graduate School.
3. The candidate must have completed at least six hours of course work on the graduate
4. program.
5. When all steps above are completed, the advisor will inform the Graduate School, and the candidate will be removed from probation.

Clinical Experiences

There are two Clinical Experiences in the Early Childhood Unified Graduate Program:

CD 841: Center-Based Clinical Experience

CD 861: Home Based Clinical Experience

Each Clinical Experience requires completion of 150 clock hours in an approved center-based program (CD 841) or home-based program (CD 861) over a period of at least five weeks.

Permission to Participate in the Clinical Experiences

Even though students are admitted to degree candidacy, enrollment in the two clinical experiences required in this program is not automatic. Following approval of agreement and approval forms the university supervisor enrolls candidates in the clinical experiences. Candidates will

be evaluated on knowledge, skills and dispositions required for success in the two clinical experiences, CD 841 and CD 861. Students will be given a copy of the dispositions rating form after acceptance into the program. If a student does not meet expectations, he/she will not be allowed to enroll in the Clinical Experiences.

Graduation Requirements

In order to receive a master's degree in early childhood education, candidates must accomplish the following:

1. Complete the program of study outlined below.
2. A grade of B or better must be earned in all courses required by the Early Childhood Unified programs. This includes prerequisite courses, in order to move forward in the program.
3. Maintain at least 3.00 overall grade point average.
4. Demonstrate dispositions of professional/ethical standards throughout the program.
5. Complete a series of three capstone credits outlined in the candidate's degree plan.

Improvements Based on Assessment Data identify key areas for assessing improvement strategies

1. Describe the specific improvement strategy. What are you going to do?

1. **Capstone Series** –As of Fall 2015, the ECU program began transitioning to a Capstone requirement to replace the Comprehensive Exam requirement. At this time candidates take a series of three credit hours throughout their degree completion. CD 831, CD 835, CD 844. These courses have prerequisites and are designated to be taken with specific courses. This will meet the needs of our candidates in demonstrating their understanding of developmental theory, advocacy for families and young children, and establishing a strong philosophy in the field of ECU.
2. **First Agreement with school district** - Agreement with USD 480 in Liberal, KS - USD 480/ECU MOU's will be developed and agreed upon to help USD 480 prepare qualified ECU teachers in their district.
3. **Year long experience with families** - Due to lower scores in Family & Community section of Praxis test - CD 842/843 – link with same family for the academic year, and connect with Part C agency during the year prior to the summer CD 861 infant/toddler practicum.
4. **Added Portfolio** - In 2014, the early childhood unified faculty were asked to add a Teacher Work Sample requirement for all Birth to Kindergarten licensure candidates. Therefore, CD 839 services as a teacher work sample requirement for these candidates.
5. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** - The Early Childhood Faculty has also completed several course title and number changes which more closely reflect the inclusive nature of most groups of young children in the field and the "unified" nature of the Kansas license.
6. **Maintain contact with clinical experience mentors** - Maintain contact with, and input from, mentors for practica CD 841 & CD 861 - In addition to these formal assessments, the Early Childhood Faculty maintain contact with the mentors throughout the state who guide and cooperate with our candidates. Every three years we assemble a focus group made up of employers and others in the field to request candid reflections on the quality of our candidates.
7. **Focus Groups** - We continue to conduct a focus group for review of program. Last one was Spring of 2013. Due to a faculty members sabbatical, the ECU program requested to postpone scheduled focus group. The ECU faculty are currently implementing a focus group study, Spring of 2017.

2. Identify what will be used to assess the strategy's success.

8. **Capstone Series** – This Capstone Series will be implemented beginning Fall 2015 to replace both EL 751 coursework and our traditional comprehensive exam requirement.

9. **First Agreement with school district** - Completed, documented, and signed MOU's. Agreement must pass through all of the University levels, including University council; in addition to USD 253 approval and signatures.
10. **Year long experience with families** – observe any improvement in Praxis scores in the Family & Community section
11. **Added Portfolio** – At the request of the state department, the early childhood unified faculty were asked to add a Teacher Work Sample requirement for all Birth to Kindergarten licensure candidates. Therefore, CD 839 services as a teacher work sample requirement for these candidates. Candidates receive critical feedback throughout the completion of the portfolio, yet expected to make revisions independently. Candidates must receive a passing score on the final portfolio as well as an 83% or higher in the CD 839 course.
12. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** – check for better understanding from individuals inquiring and new students
13. **Maintain contact with clinical experience mentors** – informal feedback and mentors willing to continue to mentor future Candidates
14. **Focus Groups** –Currently implementing a Focus Group Study for Spring 2017




3. Identify what the success levels are and what is acceptable performance.

1. **Capstone Series** – Capstone Series courses will receive a grade. We expect candidates to receive a 83% or higher in each one credit hour course.
2. **First Agreement with school district** - Growth through a newly formed partnership.
3. **Year long experience with families** – Increased experience and skills for professional working with infants/toddlers and families
4. **Added Portfolio** – Candidates receive critical feedback throughout the completion of the portfolio, yet expected to make revisions independently. Candidates must receive a passing score on the final portfolio as well as an 83% or higher in the CD 839 course.
5. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** – check for better understanding from individuals inquiring and new students
6. **Maintain contact with clinical experience mentors** – consistency with some practicum mentors if parts of the state
7. **Focus Groups** – feedback for strengthening program

4. Describe how the success of this strategy will improve the overall effectiveness of student learning.

1. **Capstone Series** – By completing this capstone requirement throughout the program completion, candidates should demonstrate a deeper understanding of application of both developmental theory and advocacy for the needs of the families and children they work with. Candidates develop a stronger professional philosophy and in return advocate for the needs of their families and children.
2. **First Agreement with school district** - Growth through a newly formed partnership. MOU that can be analyzed for the greater good of future partnerships with ESU's ECU
3. **Year long experience with families** – Increased experience and skills for professionals working with infants/toddlers and families
4. **Added Portfolio** – The Teacher work sample requirement is an additional means to document the application of the ECU program philosophy, pedagogy, and advocacy candidates demonstrate in a Birth to K educational setting (home-based or center-based).
5. **Course titles to align with KS ECU License** – check for better understanding from individuals inquiring and new students
6. **Maintain contact with clinical experience mentors** – consistency with some mentors if parts of the state. By using graduated candidates as mentors, these mentors will have a strong understanding of program philosophy, pedagogy, and infrastructure.
7. **Focus Groups** – feedback for strengthening program.

Attached Files

-  [TTC-ES-EARLY CHILDHOOD UNIFIED B-K-MS](#)
-  [Report](#)
-  [ECU \(B-K\) Degree Plan \(Licensure\).doc](#)

- [ECUBK2017KSDEReportFinal.docx](#)
- [Assessment2DataTables.docx](#)
- [Assessment3DataTables.docx](#)
- [Assessment1aDataTable.docx](#)
- [Assessment6DataTables.docx](#)
- [Assessment7DataTables.docx](#)
- [Assessment4DataTables.docx](#)
- [Assessment5DataTables.docx](#)
- [Assessment8DataTables.docx](#)
- [Assessment2CD839Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment2CD839SectionIII.docx](#)
- [Assessment3CD841Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment4CD861ObservationLead.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD730CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD832CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD838CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD839CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD841CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD843CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD844CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment5CD861CourseGrade.docx](#)
- [Assessment6CD835ActionPlan.docx](#)
- [Assessment7CD842FamilyProject.docx](#)
- [Assessment8CD737FinalProject.docx](#)

Program Name : Elementary Education BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

All elementary teacher education courses address aspects of this framework in the areas of Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. Each course in the Elementary Education program identifies in the syllabus the elements of the conceptual framework that are to be emphasized. The elementary education program and the unit's programs are designed to develop candidates who are proficient Professional Educators. Program graduates are skilled practitioners who are prepared with essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions in elementary education.

Based on Assessment Data identify key areas for assessing improvement strategies.

1. Describe the specific improvement strategy. What are you going to do?
 - a. Elementary Education: The Department Chair and faculty will connect with distant USD's and other partnership programs to design pathways to improve recruitment of future Elementary Education Majors. Piloting in the fall 2016 - spring 2017. Maize, Kansas USD (266) will help work with Elementary Education to develop a high school to BEST program Elementary Education major Pipeline.
 - b. Elementary Education Advising will work with the Department Chair to develop Community College Partnership Articulation Agreements.
 - c. Elementary Education Professional Development School MOU's will be developed and help connect Elementary Education majors to their Professional Development School locations.
 - d. Praxis II Series training will be developed to assist Block I, Block II, and Block III pre-service teacher candidates with resources they need to be successful for licensure exams required by state licensure requirements.
2. Identify what will be used to assess the strategy's success.
 - a. Piloted Pipeline survey data from the BEST Program and El Ed Re-Design Committee sent to current Cohort, Block I, Block II, Block III students and to alumni using Survey Monkey.
 - b. Completed Articulation Agreements.
 - c. Completed, documented, and signed MOU's.
 - d. Meetings and partnership discussions with Donnelly College. All documents and forms have been processed through Shelia Markowitz office.
 - e. Praxis II score results and analysis.
3. Identify what the success levels are and what is acceptable performance.
 - a. Growth through newly formed partnerships. The newly created "Degree in 3" has been discussed with The Teachers College Dean and the Academic Leadership Council and will be moving forward. A newly formed partnership with the Olathe Public School System working with the "21st Century Program" and Olathe East High School.

- b. Partnerships that are now connecting Community Colleges to ESU. This will provide cohesion and balance for the Community College transfer.
 - c. MOU's that can be analyzed for the greater good of the Professional Development School partnership.
 - d. Elementary Education Majors can become successful with the Praxis II series.
4. Describe how the success of this strategy will improve the overall effectiveness of student learning.
- a. A pipeline can be maintained and serve as a way to identify majors earlier coming into the field of Elementary Education.
 - b. Articulation is a way to keep cleaner balanced communication among all parties involves as well as provides a strong commitment.
 - c. With 47 Professional Development School Partnerships, the MOU's provide a solid partnership with all parties involved.
 - d. Students do not receive a diploma at the Elementary level unless they pass the Praxis II series. By being successful on their Praxis II, students will be able to graduate from Emporia State University.

Attached Files

- [TTC-ES-ELEMENTARY EDUCATION-BS](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Data Tables](#)
- [Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 KPTP Template.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Tables 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Tables 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 New Lesson Evaluation Tool 2017.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table 2016-17 \(1\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Old Lesson Eval Tool 2014-2017.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 7 PE Project and scoring Rubric.docx](#)
- [Elementary Education Program of Study.pdf](#)
- [ESU KSDE Elementary Program Report.docx](#)

Program Name : Instructional Specialist (Reading Specialist) MST

Summary of Program Assessments:

Reading Specialist PK-12 (licensure is also available)

The Instructional Specialist Reading program is intended for the teaching practitioner in settings from early childhood through adolescence and young adulthood.

Through the program, the candidates will learn to deal more effectively with diverse candidate learners and move from theory to best practice in the field. The Reading Specialist PK-12 serves practicing teachers, elementary or secondary, who wish to acquire initial reading specialist licensure with a master's degree in Kansas. It is based on the International Literacy Association's Standards for Reading Professionals (ILA: formerly the International Reading Association). In 2009, the International Reading Association awarded ESU the Certificate of Distinction for the elementary education reading program.

The master's degree does not require Kansas state licensure completion and is open to out-of-state applicants. The program is available online and is designed to:

provide specialized training for teachers to work with children in the classroom or in reading programs; enhance a teacher's expertise in reading to serve as a district- or building-level leader as an instructional specialist, reading teacher, or literacy coach; provide coursework that may be transferred to other states with the approval of the licensing state; prepare educators for teaching reading and language arts in a community college; provide master's level preparation for doctoral programs in reading and language arts; provide the coursework and requirements for a Kansas Initial Specialist License—Reading Specialist through an accredited program. The ESU Reading Specialist Program is accredited by the Kansas State Department of Education and CAEP. Options Students who have earned a previous master's degree may enroll as a Licensure Only student and will only need to complete a 19-hour program.

AY17

Reading Specialist PK-12

Goals for FY 17, expand the programs design and marketing outlook to reach more USD partnerships.

1. Identify a Program Coordinator **AY16**. Dr. Melissa Reed is currently serving as the program coordinator.
2. Assist with the alignment of the Reading Specialist program to the newly created Instructional Specialist El Ed Licensure Program.
3. Create new potential communication networks with KSDE.
4. Identify ways to create other state affiliated partnerships.
5. Discuss licensure changes that are currently impacting K - 12 education platforms in the state of Kansas.

Attached Files

- [ESU Reading Specialist Program Report \(Final\) 14-15](#)
- [TTC-ES-INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALIST-MS](#)
- [Assessment](#)
- [Praxis II Requirements](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Table for Praxis II.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Instructional BDA Unit Rubric \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Case Study Eval. \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table for Multicultural Literature Inventory \(2016-17\)\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Case Study Eval. \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Multicultural Inventory Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table for Professional Development Needs Assessment \(15 16\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Professional Development Rubric \(2016-17\) .docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Digital Presentation 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table \(2016-17\).docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 4-3-2-1 Response Rubric.docx](#)
- [ESU Reading Specialist 2016-17.docx](#)
- [Program of Study Reading Specialist.doc](#)

Program Name : Instructional Specialist (STEM)

Summary of Program Assessments:

This 35-credit hour online program is intended for the licensed* K-6 teacher interested in improving their practices related to the teaching and learning of STEM. It is designed to provide the graduate student with coursework in educational foundations and all areas of STEM education, with opportunities for customization of the program through STEM electives.

Graduates from this program will develop their:

- content knowledge in STEM fields for grades K-6
- awareness of current trends and opportunities in STEM fields for grades K-6
- teaching skills in STEM fields that engage students in investigation and critical thinking
- coaching and leadership skills in order to support teachers

This program does not lead to a teaching license

Current Recruitment Efforts:

Number of applications to the program and active student numbers have continued to increase through a recruitment initiative that the Department Chair and STEM committee have led. In particular:

- The Department Chair created new partnerships in Missouri and Kansas (i.e., Turner Public Schools) to create STEM partnerships for teachers to join new Instructional Specialist STEM cohorts.
- The STEM committee began to recruit from our current undergraduate ELED program, speaking to students about the Instructional Specialist program during Block Three seminars and recruiting events.
- A recruitment program was designed for December Block Three graduates who will teach in the Olathe Public Schools. In particular, the program advertises a course progression that allows for the completion of at least fifteen credit hours prior to the start of their appointment in the classroom, and subsequent Olathe Partnership Courses.

AY17

The Department Chair will continue to utilize the Instructional Specialist STEM partnerships as to increase program enrollment growth. In particular:

- In Summer 2017, the Department Chair will create new partnerships in the state New York and Kansas to continue the partnership growing initiative.
- In Summer 2017, the Department Chair will work with three districts located in Southeast Kansas to determine innovative methods to engage teachers the Instructional Specialist STEM graduate program.
- A recruitment program will be designed for December Block Three graduates, similar to the that which was created for student who will teach in Olathe public Schools In particular, the program advertises a course progression that allows for the completion of at least fifteen credit hours prior to the start of their appointment in the classroom

Current Growth Efforts:

In Fall 2016, a new STEM certificate was designed, and the curricular change process was launched to seek approval to offer the certificate as an option for potential students interested in STEM education. At the time that this report was drafted, the Committee on Advanced Programs within The Teachers College had approved the degree.

The certificate was designed as a recruitment initiative to increase graduate student enrollment in the Instructional Specialist STEM program concentration courses. Further, the certificate was designed to offer potential students who are interested in learning more about STEM education, but who hold another master's degree, an option for pursuing their interested in STEM education. This particular need was identified in conversations between the department chair and USD's throughout the state of Kansas.

AY17

A newly created STEM Certificate has been approved by the department faculty. This is a recruitment initiative to find innovative ways to increase graduate student enrollment in the Instructional Specialist STEM Program partnering with USD's to identify educators that want to further their content knowledge without having to complete a Master's Degree due to the fact they might already have a Master's Degree.

Current Program Improvement Efforts:

In Fall 2016, the STEM committee launched its first Focus Group program review in an effort to determine areas for growth within the program. The Focus Group report will be completed in Summer 2017.

AY18

Once the Focus Group report is completed, the STEM Committee intends to pursue improvements to the program based on that data. For example, initial data indicates students are interested in additional STEM elective options, and the STEM Committee is working to determine existing additional courses outside of the department and courses that could be designed and offered within the department to meet the need.

Attached Files

[TTC-ES-INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALIST-MS](#)

[ProgRpt STEM 2017 TH](#)

[📄 Engineering Notebook Example](#)

Program Name : Instructional Specialist Elementary Content

Summary of Program Assessments:

Instructional Specialist Elementary Content

Elementary Content

The Instruction Specialist – Elementary Content program is a 35-credit online program. It is intended for the teaching practitioner in settings from early childhood through adolescence and young adulthood. A candidate for this program is typically an educator intending to remain in a general education classroom or work as an instructional specialist/team leader in the school setting with specific content or topics. This concentration allows for personalization in course selection to best meet the needs of the learner.

The candidate will learn to deal more effectively with diverse student learners and move from theory to best practice in the field. The Elementary Content is designed for educators who wish to improve their teaching, management, and assessment skills. A capstone project will be completed during EL829, Leadership and Coaching Practicum.

This program does not lead to a teaching license.

Current Recruitment Efforts

The number of applications to the program and active student numbers have continued to increase through recruitment efforts of the Department Chair, program faculty and the Department Graduate Advisor. Specific efforts have included:

- A Recruitment Fair for graduating Elementary Education majors at the conclusion of each semester.
- Attendance by the Graduate Advisor at the Olathe Recruitment event
- Distribution of printed material

AY17

The creation of an Elementary Education Masters Licensure program, with expected launch in Fall 2017 (subject to KSDE and KBOR approval) has the potential to increase credit hour production significantly in the Instructional Specialist – Elementary Content program. Twenty-two hours in the El Ed Licensure program will be required hours in the Elementary Content Masters, and would have a significant impact.

Current Program Improvement Efforts:

- In Fall 2017, the Elementary Content Faculty will create a Focus Group program review to determine areas for growth within the program. The Focus Group report will be completed in Summer 2018.
- Once the Focus Group report is completed, the Elementary Content Faculty intends to pursue improvements to the program based on that data.

Attached Files

[📄 TTC-ES-INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALIST-MS](#)

[📄 Assessment](#)

Program Name : Special Education (High Incidence) MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Program Overview

The graduate program in Special Education is dedicated to improving the lives of children and youth with special needs – children and youth with mild/moderate disabilities and/or children and youth who are gifted, talented, and creative.

The following are available through the Special Education program:

- [Master of Science - Special Education - Adaptive Concentration](#)
- [Special Education - Adaptive Endorsement](#)
- [Master of Science - Special Education - Gifted, Talented, and Creative Concentration](#)
- [Special Education - Gifted Endorsement \(K-6, 6-12\)](#)
- [Certificate in Autistic Spectrum Disorders \(ASD\)](#)

Both concentrations have a 24-credit hour endorsement program and a 36-credit hour master's degree. The curriculum of each concentration meets the endorsement standards for Early Childhood through Late Childhood (Grades K to 6) and Early Adolescence through Late Adolescence (Grades 6 to 12).

Admissions Requirements

To gain admission...

1. for the Adaptive concentration, candidates must possess a cumulative or last 60 semester hour grade-point average of 2.75 based on a four-point scale; admission to the Gifted, Talented and Creative concentration requires a 3.00 overall or 3.25 on the last 60 hours.
2. Adaptive and Gifted applicants must submit:
 - three letters of recommendation,
 - three disposition assessments, and
 - a personal letter that addresses goals and interests.

If a candidate has previously received a grade of B or better in a required course, the advisor may approve the substitution of graduate level, degree appropriate electives. All candidates must be accepted into the degree program before starting the first practicum.

Degree Candidacy Requirements

Candidacy is the formal approval for pursuit of the master's degree after it is determined that all specified criteria have been met. Upon completion of six to 12 hours, candidates should make application through their advisor. Candidates need to:

1. file a degree plan filed through their advisor; and
2. maintain a B average with no grade lower than B in core courses is required in all courses for the Adaptive Program.
3. In addition to the requirements of Emporia State's Graduate School, the Graduate Essay Examination administered by the department must be passed. The Graduate Essay Examination should be completed during the first term of enrollment. The Adaptive Program does not require this.
4. The candidate must apply for degree candidacy after completing between six and 15 hours of course work. A candidate must be a degree candidate before enrolling in thesis or the second practicum.

Other Requirements for Special Education

A degree program must be completed and approved before the second term of enrollment.

Adaptive candidates complete a final presentation of their Master's Project. Gifted candidates can complete the comprehensive examination or thesis. For candidates selecting the thesis option, a thesis committee consisting of two faculty members from the field and one member outside the field will need to be selected. Candidates selecting the thesis option are required to take an oral examination over their thesis area and research.

Candidates selecting the non-thesis degree option will be required to take a written comprehensive examination at the end of graduate study covering their course work. For applicants who have been denied admission: Before reapplying for a graduate program, an applicant must:

1. complete all background deficiencies and
2. repeat undergraduate courses to raise the GPA on the last 60 hours to 2.75 for Adaptive and 3.25 for Gifted.

Graduation Requirements

In order to receive a master's degree from this department the candidate must accomplish the following:

1. complete an approved program of study as developed and approved by the candidate's faculty advisor;
2. be admitted to Degree Candidacy;
3. complete a master's capstone project (SD 899) OR complete a master's level thesis; and
4. complete an Intent to Graduate Form (submit to the Graduate School).

Attached Files

- [TTC-ES-ADAPTIVE SPECIAL EDUCATION-MS](#)
- [Assess 5 Rubric Independent Case Study Analysis](#)
- [Assess 7 Rubric Behavior Intervention Project](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table for Functional Behavior-Intervention Plan Project](#)

- [Assess 6 Rubric Adaptive Practicum II Portfolio](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table for Practicum II Portfolio](#)
- [Assess 5 Rubric Independent Case Study Analysis](#)
- [Assess 8 Data Table for Collaboration-Consultation Analysis Paper](#)
- [Assess 8 Rubric Collaboration-Consultation Analysis Paper](#)
- [Assess 4 Rubric for Videotaped Lesson Assignment](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table for Videotaped Lesson Assignment](#)
- [Assess 3 Rubric Adaptive Practicum I Portfolio Assessment Rubric](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table for Practicum I Portfolio](#)
- [Assess 2 Rubric Instructional Planning Project](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table for Instructional Planning Project](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables for Praxis II Special Education: Core Knowledge](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table for Independent Case Study Analysis](#)
- [Adaptive Special Education KSDE Report 2014](#)
- [Assess 1 Data Tables for Praxis II Special Education 2014-2017.docx](#)
- [Assess 4 Data Table DI UDL Literacy Lesson Plan Project.doc](#)
- [Assess 2 Data Table IEP Lesson Plan Activity 2017.doc](#)
- [Assess 3 Practicum Final Evaluation Form.docx](#)
- [Assess 3 Data Table Practicum Final Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assess 2 IEP Lesson Plan Activity Rubric 2017.doc](#)
- [Assess 4 DI UDL Literacy Lesson Plan Project Rubric 2017.doc](#)
- [Assess 5 Data Table Course Grades SD700 SD702 SD800 SD803 SD820.doc](#)
- [Assess 6 Data Table FBA BIP Project 2017 copy.doc](#)
- [Assess 6 FBA BIP Project Rubric 2017 .doc](#)
- [Assess 7 Family and Community Engagement Paper Rubric 2017.doc](#)
- [Assess 7 Data Table Family Community Engagement Paper 2017.doc](#)
- [ESU KSDE High Incidence Report.docx](#)
- [HighIncidenceProgram of Study.doc](#)

Program Name : Special Education (Gifted) MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

Graduate Data Report
Gifted 2017

Describe the specific improvement strategy. What are you going to do?

1. Evaluate Gifted program course syllabi, instructional content and pedagogical skills for evidence to meet the 2016 KSDE Gifted program Standards and revise program assessments accordingly.
2. Analyze Gifted program syllabi, course content, instructional skills and professional dispositions through the grid of the five content categories of the Gifted Praxis exam for areas of strength and areas to improve.
3. Effectively communicate applicable college, graduate and university policies and procedures in a Gifted program handbook and post on the Gifted program website.
4. Develop professional practice opportunities for Gifted program students and alumni through on-campus Saturday and Summer Enrichment Camps offerings with diverse gifted learners.

Identify what will be used to assess the strategy's success.

1. Determine evidence through a close alignment between key elements of Content Knowledge and Professional Skills for each function of the 2016 KSDE Gifted Program content standards with the 2016 Gifted program assessments.
2. Identify strengths and area to improve through statistical analysis of completer scores in the five content categories of Gifted Praxis Examination: Development and Characteristics of Gifted Students (21%), Learning Environment for Gifted Students (19%), Instruction of Gifted Students (28%), Identification and Assessment of Gifted Students (18%), and Professionalism (14%).
3. Request student feedback on Gifted program handbook application, advisement, activities, assessment and alumni regarding clarity, applicability and ease of use.
4. Analyze feedback from Saturday and Summer Enrichment camps from students, teachers and supervisor for effective teaching and

[KSDE Gifted Report Rejoinder Rev..docx](#)

[Gifted Scoring Rubrics 1-8 Rejoinder Rev..docx](#)

[Gifted Data Tables 1-8 Rejoinder Rev..docx](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The Department Leadership Committee (DLC) and the shared governance model is working well for the department. The transition from a comprehensive exam, removal of all admittance essay's to capstone experiences should serve all programs well as you will be able to assess student learning over a series of three one-hour courses which will allow for a better understanding and observation of student achievement and growth in learning over time. It will also allow for efficient changes to individual course curriculum as assessment findings can be employed on a term-by-term basis. It will allow for greater flexibility in improving the student learning experience. The growth strategies through MOU's and affiliations with school districts and aligning certificate programs with the needs of the education fields in specific areas like special education adaptive and gifted programs serves vital needs and the emphasis on STEM education is warranted as well. These programs are in need of educators with expertise and credentials and the department is working very hard at growing and improving these most important programs through sound assessment practices and improvement strategies. The accelerated masters of education degree coming online this past summer is exciting. This program is an excellent addition to the department and we may need to add the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Plan for the planned assessments? Or, is it going to be a part of the KSDE/CAEP advanced programs. We can visit about this at our next opportunity.

In your 5-Year Program Assessment Plan for the Instructional Specialist (STEM/Elementary Content) MS, we need to do a little bit of tweaking to the plan. It is off by a year, with the assessment of the EL726 course being listed in the Year 5 Executive Summary section. Other than the continuation of the capstone evaluation, this 5th year is one of reflection and putting strategies into place going into the next 5-year cycle. We can visit about what you would like to do with this as well. It just depends on how you see the assessment of the program working out best.

Using focus group data to inform the curriculum is key to keeping the faculty abreast of the expectations of the external environment. I read through the data and comments from the alumni survey and with the exception of a couple of suggestions regarding assessment/data analysis and teaching reading, it was a very positive survey report. It is recognized that the department has been very proactive in adapting to the external environment to meet the needs of the State of Kansas in teacher preparation. There has been a complete revision of the KSDE standards impacting all programs, in addition to the transition to the CAEP review that is upcoming in the 2018 Academic Year. As the KSDE reports for your programs are completed and become available, be sure to upload them as evidence files in the respective file repository areas. In the years I've been observing your department and program level assessment plans, there is sound evidence that assessment strategies are being employed at many levels and the refinement of your processes continue to occur. Reading these assessment plans, strategies, and implemented changes is refreshing and the perpetuation of the programs is evident of assessment findings being used to improve the student learning experience. These strategies also align very succinctly with the needs of the State of Kansas in professionally educating future and current elementary education teachers. You are a model department for Emporia State University! Kudos and keep up the exceptional work.

Academic Year 2017

The Department Leadership Committee (DLC) and the shared governance model is working well for the department. The transition from a comprehensive exam to capstone experiences should serve you well as you will be able to assess student learning over a series of three one-hour courses which will allow for a better understanding and observation of student achievement and growth in learning over time. It will also allow for efficient changes to individual course curriculum as assessment findings can be employed on a term-by-term basis. It will allow for greater flexibility in improving the student learning experience. The growth strategies through MOU's and affiliations with school districts and aligning certificate programs with the needs of the education fields in specific areas like special education adaptive and gifted programs serves vital needs and the emphasis on STEM education is warranted as well. These programs are in need of educators with expertise and credentials and the department is working very hard at growing and improving these most important programs through sound assessment practices and improvement strategies. Using focus group data to inform the curriculum is key to keeping the faculty abreast of the expectations of the external environment. I would suggest that you allow your alumni and employers being surveyed with the opportunity for qualitative feedback (or maybe you do and just don't include this information in the data provided) and or suggestions to improve the programs. It is recognized that the department has been very proactive in adapting to the external environment to meet the needs of the State of Kansas in teacher preparation. There has been a complete revision of the KSDE standards impacting all programs, in addition to the transition to the CAEP review that is upcoming in the 2018 Academic Year. As the KSDE reports for your programs are completed and become available, be sure to upload them as evidence files in the respective file repository areas. In the years I've been observing your department and program level assessment plans, there is sound evidence that assessment strategies are being employed at

many levels and the refinement of your processes continue to occur. Reading these assessment plans, strategies, and implemented changes is refreshing and the perpetuation of the programs is evident of assessment findings being used to improve the student learning experience.

These strategies also align very succinctly with the needs of the State of Kansas in professionally educating future and current elementary education teachers. You are a model program for Emporia State University! Kudos and keep up the exceptional work.

Academic Year 2016

The Elementary Education, Early Childhood, and Special Education programs incorporate a structure that includes direction from the Teachers College Framework, KSDE Standards, and required competencies confirmed through Praxis license and certification testing. Only a few graduate program endorsements exist and these curricula are made up of the same courses within the majors. The Instructional Specialist programs were lacking in assessment planning detail and evidence; this is an opportunity area for building a more robust assessment plan. Comprehensively, the summative assessment data showed that the majority of students are meeting learning outcomes (standards and competency testing) at very high levels, and these achievements are above national averages. For the EC-unified programs it will be informative to qualitatively measure both the year long experiences with families and the data collected from practicum mentors. How will that work in getting student feedback on the year-long experience? Is the experience concurrent with coursework? The practicum mentor piece, do you intend to have a survey or what feedback loop do you have planned. This is interesting assessment work, so I'm hoping to learn about how we will capture this information.

It is recognized that the department is doing some cutting edge work in preparing teachers to teach using a variety of electronic mediums (Ipad/tablet initiative). The KSDE standards do list teaching using technologies as important skills, so I'll be interested in learning about how we intend to measure and assess the quality and efficacy of these newest technology as a tool to teach strategies. Also, CAEP and KSDE are in a change process of updating standards and required reporting, so it is anticipated that these changes will affect the EE, ECU, SPED department in some ways.

Finally, the department has a very robust assessment system that shows us the rear-window view for how are our students (candidates) are faring at the completion of the program. I wouldn't change this process, it is productive, graduates are successful, and alumni and employers confirm the successes of the program as well. It has the mechanisms in place to tweak curriculum and pedagogies and to keep programs current. The online programs are well structured and have multiple checkpoints as well. I did notice some redundancies in the reporting for gifted, as it appears some cutting and pasting has occurred from previous reports including some comments that were made by the previous assessment director. The improvement strategies for this program were good. The challenge will be to stay ahead of the game. Develop some assessment strategies (effectiveness strategies) that bring in new information like what ways will teacher preparation be changing in the near future, so that faculty can engage in strategies to incorporate change into the system as early adopters, spend efforts on environmental scans, be proactive in some approaches that you believe will inform change more quickly. Use assessment as a way to keep the department consistently engaged in adaptive change. These are suggestions, not directives, it's hard to provide new ideas for helpful feedback on an outstanding program that has very few if any areas that aren't solid.

Academic Year 2015

The department's assessment structure has been enhanced at the department and individual program levels over the past year. This is evident in the depth and breadth of the evidence documents and the goals and directives for growing and improving programs. The efforts of the Department Leadership Committee serves to ensure that all programs are represented and to coordinate within-department strategies. In addition, DLC's providing feedback to program faculty and coordinating the enhancement of assessment practices including student assessments, student learning outcome requirements, updated course syllabi and inclusion of updated SLO's and matching practices to ongoing student assessment protocols is evidence of best practices. This is a forward thinking strategy to keep everyone involved in the continuous practice of improving student learning.

The work done over the past year for updating curriculum maps and aligning syllabi student learning outcomes confirms the currency of the programs in the department. In addition, a current curriculum infrastructure enables successful improvement strategies such as improving collaboration with other entities, and expanding instruction and learning experiences, and promoting program growth. It's all connected.

In reviewing the depth and breadth of not only the coordinated assessment efforts for all programs, but the forward-thinking strategies that are being employed to improve the department across all programs is outstanding. I'm very excited to see just how much success is accomplished over the 2017 academic year. The department has been very professionally positioned for both improved learning and growth. Most excellent work!

Providing Department: Elementary Education, Early Childhood and Special Education

Responsible Roles:

Jerald Liss (E10329679), Sharon Brown (E10342122), Tiffany Hill (E11076313), Heather Caswell (E10329794), Melissa Reed (E10088382), Matt Seimears (E10088253), Marjorie Bock (E10185494), Connie Phelps (E10000172), Scott Waters (E10087985)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----**RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1****Instructional Specialist (STEM/Elementary Content) MS**

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:**Instructional Specialist STEM:**

This 35-credit hour online program is intended for the licensed* K-6 teacher interested in improving their practices related to the teaching and learning of STEM. It is designed to provide the graduate student with coursework in educational foundations and all areas of STEM education, with opportunities for customization of the program through STEM electives.

Graduates from this program will develop their:

- content knowledge in STEM fields for grades K-6
- awareness of current trends and opportunities in STEM fields for grades K-6
- teaching skills in STEM fields that engage students in investigation and critical thinking
- coaching and leadership skills in order to support teachers

This program does not lead to a teaching license.

Course Selected for Assessment: EL 751 Applications of Developmental Theories.

Student assignments will be analyzed using a rubric and have a double faculty blind review process using the created rubric to assess each students level of success as they journey through the program. The assignments will be thematically woven through the course work required for the 35 credit hour Instructional Specialist STEM Concentration masters Degree.

Summary 2019

Attached Files

[TTC-ES-INSTRUCTIONAL SPECIALIST-MS](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Course Selected for Assessment: EL 810 Information Literacy and EL 725 Differentiating Instruction.

Student assignments will be analyzed using a rubric and have a double faculty blind review process using the created rubric to assess each students level of success as they journey through the program. The assignments will be thematically woven through the course work required for the 35 credit hour Instructional Specialist STEM Concentration masters Degree.

Summary 2019**Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:**

Course Selected for Assessment: EL 828 Instructional Leadership and Coaching and ER 752 Analysis of Research.

Student assignments will be analyzed using a rubric and have a double faculty blind review process using the created rubric to assess each students level of success as they journey through the program. The assignments will be thematically woven through the course work required for the 35 credit hour Instructional Specialist STEM Concentration masters Degree.

Summary 2020

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Course Selected for Assessment: EL 803 Best Practices in Elementary Science and IT 727 Integrating Educational Technology in Teaching.

Student assignments will be analyzed using a rubric and have a double faculty blind review process using the created rubric to assess each students level of success as they journey through the program. The assignments will be thematically woven through the course work required for the 35 credit hour Instructional Specialist STEM Concentration masters Degree.

Summary 2021**Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:**

Course Selected for Assessment: EL 726 Elementary Engineering and Robotics and EL 802 Best Practices in Elementary Mathematics.

Student assignments will be analyzed using a rubric and have a double faculty blind review process using the created rubric to assess each students level of success as they journey through the program. The assignments will be thematically woven through the course work required for the 35 credit hour Instructional Specialist STEM Concentration masters Degree.

Due AY 2022

Providing Department: Instructional Specialist (STEM)

Responsible Roles: Matt Seimears (E10088253)

UNIT REPORT

HPER Annual Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:41 AM

**Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

The programs in the department with KSDE and CAEP accreditations are going to be working towards completing reports for submission and preparing for supporting the self-study for CAEP that will be submitted in the spring. The faculty will be entering their course embedded assessment results in the new reporting tool. The Health Promotion, Recreation, and Advanced Physical Education MS programs will be implementing their 5-Year assessment plans. We are also experimenting with transitioning our student surveys to the campus labs Baseline tool. Overall, there are faculty assessment efforts ongoing in all programs of study.

AY 2017

This year HPER will look at the individual programs that are not accredited by KSDE or specialized accreditation entities, which are Health Promotion and Recreation, and indicate other points in the program that have assessments aligned with program standards. We will also update any changes to the current Curriculum Maps for all programs.

AY 2016

Every year the department evaluates each of the 5 undergraduate programs and 1 graduate program. Each program has developed assessment points, gathered data from those completed assessments, compiled that data into tables, analyses the results to make goals for change in the future, and all information is summarized in a report. Health Education, Physical Education and the Masters of Science in Health, Physical Education and Recreation (also referred to by KSDE as Advanced PHE) annually submit these reports to KSDE in their required formats. Athletic Training submits their annual reports to CAATE in their required formats. Health Promotion and Athletic Training currently follow the former required template from PASL, but will look at different formats to align more with other department reports in the future.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

This was a busy year for the HPER faculty, as the Health Promotion major was renamed to Health and Human Performance. The Health Education BSE and Physical Education BSE programs completed their three-year assessments and completed their KSDE reports and submitted them for review in October 2017. The faculty in all programs participated in the assessment and reporting of their courses using the newly implemented course level student learning outcomes assessment reporting tool. The reports for these assessments are summarized in the 5-Year Program Assessment Plans as for the HPER MS, Health Promotion, and Recreation programs. The Athletic Training program is in the process of submitting a masters program to the Kansas Board of Regents for approval. The accreditation program for Athletic Training is now determining that a masters level of training is required to seek certified athletic training certification. The program will continue to align its assessment activities as required by the CAATE accreditation standards.

AY 2017

As a department, all of our programs are including more faculty and student input on the assessment plans and the annual reports. The new process will be to have data compiled for a year and then the HPER Undergraduate and Graduate faculty committees will compile the data, formulate the results in a report, analyze the data and implement changes based on these findings. Previously the department chair took care of the first two and then faculty analyzed and then came up with plans for change.

Another area of assessment improvement that the department will work towards is developing more comprehensive assessments all

throughout programs and not just at the end of programs. This will start with each program's curriculum map and work to evaluate each course and assessments within those courses. This plan will follow the 5-year assessment plans we will establish.

With these changes and transitions, we will have data due by May of one year and report submitted, along with implemented changes noted, by May of the following year.

AY 2016

As a department, 4 of the 6 programs have required reports that they must follow those guidelines. These four will remain the same, except for having annual data aggregated and evaluated by faculty. The two other programs (Health Promotion and Recreation) will look at having more defined assessments and create a report that follows along a three-year trend rather than just data from that one year. With the new assessments that we will develop for the coming year, and starting a 3 year average of these, it can give us more visual on trends on those assessments.

Attached Files

- [📄 Program Review Indicators - HPER 2016](#)
- [📄 Program Review Indicators - HPER 2015](#)
- [📄 Program Review Indicators - HPER 2014](#)
- [📄 HPER_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)
- [📄 Program Review Indicators - HPER 2017](#)
- [📄 Senior Survey Results - Health, Physical Education, and Recreation - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [📄 Program Review Indicators - HPER 2018](#)

Program Name: Athletic Training BS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

There were two graduating seniors for AY 2018, both seniors passed the Board of Certification examination on their first attempt. (This is the national exam for athletic training)

The athletic training program at Emporia State University has a three year aggregate, first-time pass rate of 100%. (minimum requirement is 70%)

The program is continuing progress on transitioning to a master's degree program. We will incorporate these program changes into our existing assessment plan in fulfillment of the requirements of CAATE accreditation.

AY 2017

Athletic Training has a lot of changes coming up in the next 5 years and they are preparing for those changes. The requirement by CAATE accreditation is to be a Graduate Level program by year 2022, so the faculty in Athletic Training are working towards this transition. Along with the other programs, Athletic Training will have the HPER Undergraduate program review their 2016-2017 annual data in order to make suggestions for improvement. This will take place over the 2017-2018 academic year and will be submitted May 2018

AY 2016

Athletic Training Report is an online submission, where we report the necessary data. This is followed up by CAATE replying with aggregated comments based on that data. From this, the Athletic Training faculty set goals and changes to program in order to improve for the next year.

Two main points from last year that are central to our goals for next year:

- 1) Our student pass rate on the BOC was over 70%, which shows that the changes we made to the program have been effective, so we will continue with these changes.
- 2) CAATE mandated this year that by 2022 all accredited Athletic Training programs must be at the graduate level. With this new mandate, we have been working hard to develop a plan of action and a needs assessment in order to proceed. The goal for this year is to have a proposal ready for the Board of Regents to approve and a plan of transition from undergraduate to graduate level courses.

Attached Files

- [📄 CAATE AR 14 15 Section I General Program Info](#)

- [CAATE AR 14 15 Section II Applicants and Enrollment](#)
- [CAATE AR 14 15 Section III Faculty](#)
- [CAATE AR 14 15 Section IV Program Operations](#)
- [CAATE AR 14 15 Section V Outcomes](#)
- [CAATE AR 14 15 Section VI Access to Information and Compliance](#)
- [TTC-HP-ATHLETIC TRAINING-BS](#)
- [Athletic Training CAATE Report 2013-2014](#)
- [Athletic Training CAATE Report Summary 2013-2014](#)

Program Name: Health Education BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The KSDE report Section V provides information about how information and data from program assessments will be used to improve student success. The following information was reported in the October 2017 report submitted to the Kansas Department of Education.

Data collected on the candidates is reviewed on an annual basis. All data is aggregated during the summer and then presented to the undergraduate committee for review and analysis in the fall. From this initial review, recommendations and program changes are made to strengthen the candidates' performance in relation to the health education standards. Data and recommendations are brought to the faculty for further review. Any curriculum changes and program reviews follow the university review process for curriculum review. This process includes the following sequence

1. Review by HPER undergraduate committee
2. Review by HPER faculty
3. Council on Teacher Education or Committee on Advance Programs review
4. University faculty review

During 2013-2014, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. Increased reflection practices in HL390: School Health Programs, HL400: Health Risk Factors, & HL559: Health Education Methods & to also focus on the "WHY" of reflection.
2. Created an alternative lesson plan with modifications/adaptations to meet ALL student needs in PE390.
3. Added in more practical applications of modifications for lessons in PE264: Special Populations lab.
4. Included additional content into courses to support content included on the Praxis II content exams.

During 2014-2015, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. Course numbering changes were made to Health Risk Factors (changed HL400 to HL350) and to School Health Programs (changed HL390 to HL450) so accurately show the course sequence.
2. HL350: Health Risk Factors was made a pre-requisite for HL450: School Health Programs so students had needed content going into HL450.

During 2015-2016, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. Review of the Unit Plan Analysis and the Electronic Portfolio were done to update the requirements and align with the program standards.
2. Specifically, the Electronic Portfolio was evaluated as to how it aligns with standard 3 and how it can better meet this standard.
3. Examined the changes made in the previous year with the HL350 and HL450 progression to monitor student success for program completion.

During 2016-2017, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. Based on the Praxis II content exam data, specifically the subcategory 5: Health Education Pedagogy, faculty have received and made changes to the Electronic Portfolio assignment in order to provide an alternative numerical system on the rubric in order to be able to provide more feedback and evaluation for the students.
2. Based on changes within the teacher education program, such as the transition from the TWS to the KPTP and moving to the STAR student teaching evaluation form, faculty are reviewing the new data in order to make changes to course preparation so that we can prepare our students for these changes.
3. Based on the review from the Student Teaching Evaluation, faculty have made adjustments to the HPER department disposition form being used to assess students throughout the health education program. The EPP has just implemented a new disposition tool which consistently aligns with the Health Education version and works in tandem with it so they will all align together. The evidence supports the idea that starting dispositions earlier in our program has led to fewer candidates with issues when in field placement in methods and student teaching.
4. Implemented a 5 year program rotation review of all courses to focus on each course and how the course aligns with the program and program

standards.

AY 2017

Health Education is in a transition from NCATE accreditation to CAEP accreditation, with plans to be completely ready Fall 2018. We have been transitioning some of our assessments and will be analyzing those changes over the 2017-2018 academic year. One thing that was worked on over the 2016-2017 year was reviewing and making adjustments to the dispositions forms being used to assess students throughout the health education program.

Also, we are awaiting the Kansas Department of Education process to announce new standards for Health Education. With this, will be a lot of changes based on what the changes to the standards are and at this point we do not know what that will be.

Along with the other programs, Health Education will have the HPER Undergraduate program review their 2016-2017 annual data in order to make suggestions for improvement. This will take place over the 2017-2018 academic year and will be submitted May 2018.

AY 2016

Attached is the Health Education annual report compiled and submitted to KSDE. Based on the assessment data gathered and information provided in the report, the faculty has made the following changes:

1. Review of the Unit Plan Analysis and the Electronic Portfolio were done to update the requirements and align with the program more.
2. Specifically, the Electronic Portfolio will be evaluated as to how it aligns with standard 3 and how it can better meet this standard.
3. Observe the changes that were made in the previous year with the HL350 and HL450 progression. Hoping to see that this will improve student success in the next year with program completers's.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 2 Rubric - TWS 1-4](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric - TWS 5-7](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide - Electronic Portfolio](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide--Unit Analysis](#)
- [HED Assessment 1 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [HED Assessment 2 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [HED Assessment 3 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [HED Assessment 4 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [HED Assessment 5 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [HED Assessment 6 Data Table--2015-2016](#)
- [HED Program Report 2015-2016](#)
- [TTC-HP-HEALTH EDUCATION-BSE](#)
- [Electronic Portfolio Rubric](#)
- [Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric](#)
- [TWS 1-4 Rubric](#)
- [TWS 5-7 Rubric](#)
- [Unit Analysis Rubric](#)
- [HED Assessment 1 Data Tables 2013-2014](#)
- [HED Assessment 2 Data Tables 2013-2014](#)
- [HED Assessment 3 Data Tables 2013-2014](#)
- [HED Assessment 4 Data Tables 2013-2014](#)
- [HED Assessment 5 Data Tables 2013-2014](#)
- [HED Assessment 6 Data Table 2013-2014](#)
- [Health Education KSDE Report 2013-2014](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables Health.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 - NEW - KPTP Tasks 1-2-2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Tables Health.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Tables Health.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)

- [Assessment 4 - NEW - KPTP Tasks 3-4 - 2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Tables Health.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 - NEW - Electronic Portfolio - 2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 - OLD - Electronic Portfolio2014-2016.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Health.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table Health.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide--Unit Analysis.doc](#)
- [Health Program of Study.doc](#)
- [ESU KSDE Report for Health.docx](#)

Program Name: Health Promotion BS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The Health Promotion BS program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan and is now being reported in this new assessment plan template.

AY 2017

Health Promotion is working to make many changes within the program. The following have been worked on in the 2016-2017 academic year:

1. Made adjustments to the disposition form to better evaluate/assess the students within Health Promotion
2. Implemented disposition assessments in two classes earlier in the program
3. Re-evaluated the program outcome number two on exit survey: "Use and integrate appropriate modes of communication, both written and spoken, and modes of technology into professional practice during the evaluation, implementation and assessment processes."

Along with the other programs, Health Promotion will have the HPER Undergraduate program review their 2016-2017 annual data in order to make suggestions for improvement. This will take place over the 2017-2018 academic year and will be submitted May 2018.

AY 2016

Attached is the Health Promotion annual report compiled and evaluated. Based on the assessment data gathered and information provided in the report, the faculty has made the following changes:

1. Starting in Fall 2015, new courses and program requirements were in place. Starting Fall 2016, new assessments will be in place and clearly identified.
2. Specific to assessments: Now that new curriculum has been established, we will identify assessments throughout the program and not just those that are in the senior year of the program. We will evaluate the curriculum map done for Health Promotion program to indicate possible places for assessments to be identified. This will not only give a larger view of the program, but also identify progression and improvement of students in those areas.
3. Consideration to revisiting the program objectives that are aligned with courses &/or with ACSM and answer the following questions: Are these still the objectives we want to focus on? If we are using ACSM as a guide, do we need to show direct alignment with our objectives and their standards?

Attached Files

- [Health Promotion Program 2015-2016 Annual Summary](#)
- [Health Promotion Program Data--20153-20155-20161](#)
- [TTC-HP-HEALTH PROMOTION-BS](#)
- [Health Promotion Assessment Data 2013-2014](#)
- [Health Promotion Annual Report](#)

Program Name: Master of Science HPER

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The HPER MS program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan and is now being reported in this new assessment plan template.

AY 2017

The Masters in Health, Physical Education and Recreation is working on major transitions this coming year as far as assessments.

Previously, when accredited by NCATE the MS in HPER had to submit annual reports along with Health and PE programs. With the transition to CAEP, there was thought that we needed to have certain changes to meet the CAEP requirements. Spring 2017 we found that we do not have to transition with CAEP and have more freedom to make some changes to our program. With the 5 year assessment plan in mind, the Graduate Committee will review the entire program and the assessments used in reporting.

Along with the other programs, the MS in HPER will have the HPER Graduate program review their 2016-2017 annual data in order to make suggestions for improvement. This will take place over the 2017-2018 academic year and will be submitted May 2018.

AY 2016

Attached is the Masters in Health, Physical Education and Recreation annual report compiled and submitted to KSDE (KSDE refers to it as the Advanced Physical Education program). Based on the assessment data gathered and information provided in the report, the faculty has made the following changes:

1. New program outcomes were established in order to update our program. These new standards will be implemented starting Fall 2016.
2. With the new outcomes, PE707 course project will also be included as a new program assessment and the assessments in PE858 and PE738 will be changes to better align with program outcomes.
3. Assessments will be given better titles to more clearly reflect what is being assessed.
4. Two new program outcomes that are introduced are Teaching and Reflection.
5. Graduate Exit Survey will be revised and used to receive valuable information regarding student perspectives.

Attached Files

- [AdvPHE Assessment#3 Current Research Practices Rubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#4 TechnologyProjectRubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#5 GraduateProjectRubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#6 EthicsandDiversityRubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#7 Graduate Exit Survey](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#2--gpaassessment--2015-2016](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#3--CurrentResearchPractices--2015-2016](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#4--techproject--2015-2016](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#5--GradResearchProject--2015-2016](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#6--ethicsanddiversitypaper--2015-2016](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#7--exitsurvey--2015-2016](#)
- [AdvPHE Program Report 2015-2016](#)
- [TTC-HP-HEALTH PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION NON THESIS-MS](#)
- [TTC-HP-HEALTH PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION THESIS-MS](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#3 Current Research Practices Rubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#4 TechnologyProjectRubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#5 GraduateProjectRubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#6 EthicsandDiversityRubric](#)
- [AdvPHE Assessment#7 Graduate Exit Survey](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment #2gpaassessment2013-2014](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#3CurrentResearchPractices2013-2014](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#4techproject2013-2014](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#5GradResearchProject2013-2014](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#6ethicsanddiversitypaper2013-2014](#)
- [AdvPHE Table Assessment#7survey2013-2014](#)
- [Masters in HPER Annual Report 2013-2014](#)

Program Name: Physical Education BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The KSDE report Section V provides information about how information and data from program assessments will be used to improve student success. The following information was reported in the October 2017 report submitted to the Kansas Department of Education.

Data collected on the candidates are reviewed on an annual basis. All data are disaggregated during the summer and then presented to the undergraduate committee for review and analysis. From this initial review, recommendations and program changes are made to strengthen the candidates' performance in relation to the physical education standards. Data and recommendations are brought to the faculty for further review. Any curriculum changes and program reviews follow the university review process for curriculum review. This process includes the following sequence

1. Review by HPER undergraduate committee
2. Review by HPER faculty
3. Council on Teacher Education or Committee on Advanced Programs review
4. University faculty review

During 2013-2014, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. Increase reflection practices in PE268, PE480, & PE570 and also focus on the "WHY" of reflection.
2. Created an alternative lesson plan with modifications/adaptations to meet ALL student needs in PE480.
3. Added in more practical applications of modifications for lessons in PE264.
4. Include more information in courses lacking content included on the Praxis II content exams.

During 2014-2015, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. Move the dance content into PE365 and removing the PE165: Foundations of PE:Dance course from the curriculum.
2. Add one hour to the PE268: Instructional Principles of Physical Education course in order to add needed content.
3. Held a physical education pedagogy retreat to review all courses to adjust for overlap of content and assess what is being covered.
4. Curriculum map completed to further look into the program standards.

During 2015-2016, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. In PE268: Instructional Principles of Physical Education included introducing lesson planning earlier in the program with more of an emphasis on planning and curriculum.
2. In the Foundation of PE courses, more assignments were include to assist candidates in identifying parts of a lesson that stand out - i.e. grouping methods. By pointing out instructional strategies earlier in the program, the candidates will hopefully retain these concepts better. ell.
3. Incorporated more opportunities for candidates to engage parents and/or other professionals outside of class.

During 2016-2017, the following changes were made based on the review of program data:

1. Implemented a 5 year program rotation review of all courses to focus on each course and how the course aligns with the program and program standards.
2. Based on the Praxis II content exam data, specifically the subcategory of Collaboration, Reflection and Technology, the faculty have made adjustments to the PE365: Games, Rhythms and Activities for Elementary PE course by moving it to two hour blocks to provide more opportunities to work with youth in local elementary schools physical education classes.
3. Based on the Praxis II content exam data, specifically the subcategory of Content Knowledge and Student Growth and Development, the faculty have decided to focus on the Electronic Portfolio assignment in order to provide evaluation in the area of student growth and development.
4. Based on changes within the teacher education program, such as the transition from the TWS to the KPTP and moving the the STAR student teaching evaluation form, faculty are reviewing this new data in order to make changes to course preparation so that we prepare our students for these changes.
5. Based on review of data from the Student Teaching Evaluation, faculty have made adjustments to the HPER departmental disposition form being used to assess students throughout the physical education program. The EPP has just implemented a new disposition tool which consistently aligns with Physical Education version and works in tandem with it so they will all align together. The evidence supports the idea that starting dispositions earlier in a our program has led to fewer candidates with issues when in field placement in methods and student teaching.

AY 2017

Physical Education is in a transition from NCATE accreditation to CAEP accreditation, with plans to be completely ready Fall 2018. We have been transitioning some of our assessments and will be analyzing those changes over the 2017-2018 academic year. One thing that was worked on over the 2016-2017 year was reviewing and making adjustments to the dispositions forms being used to assess students

throughout the health education program.

Also, we are awaiting the Kansas Department of Education process to announce new standards for Physical Education. With this, will be a lot of changes based on what the changes to the standards are and at this point we do not know what that will be.

Along with the other programs, Physical Education will have the HPER Undergraduate program review their 2016-2017 annual data in order to make suggestions for improvement. This will take place over the 2017-2018 academic year and will be submitted May 2018.

AY 2016

Attached is the Physical Education annual report compiled and submitted to KSDE. Based on the assessment data gathered and information provided in the report, the faculty has made the following changes:

1. In PE268: Instructional Principles of Physical Education, introducing lesson planning earlier with more of an emphasis on planning and curriculum.
2. In the Foundation of PE courses, having more assignments that are identifying pieces of a lesson that stand out - i.e. grouping methods. By pointing these out earlier, the students can retain these concepts better. Including them in the objectives as well.
3. Incorporating more opportunities to incorporate the importance of them as teachers to engage parents and/or other professionals more outside of class.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 2 Rubric for TWS 1-4](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric - TWS 5-7](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide - Electronic Portfolio](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide-Unit Analysis](#)
- [PHE Assessment 1 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [PHE Assessment 2 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [PHE Assessment 3 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [PHE Assessment 4 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [PHE Assessment 5 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [PHE Assessment 6 Data Tables--2015-2016](#)
- [PHE Program Report 2015-2016](#)
- [TTC-HP-PHYSICAL EDUCATION OPTION A-BSE](#)
- [TTC-HP-PHYSICAL EDUCATION OPTION B-BSE](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric - TWS 1-4](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation-NEW version](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric - TWS 5-7](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide - Electronic Portfolio](#)
- [Assessment 6 Scoring Guide-Unit Analysis](#)
- [PHE Assessment 1 Data Tables--2013-2014](#)
- [PHE Assessment 2 Data Tables--2013-2014](#)
- [PHE Assessment 3 Data Tables--2013-2014](#)
- [PHE Assessment 4 Data Tables 2013-2014](#)
- [PHE Assessment 5 Data Tables 2013-2014](#)
- [PHE Assessment 6 Data Table 2013-2014](#)
- [PhysicalEducation KSDE Report 2013-2014](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables--2016-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Tables--2016-2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2- NEW- KPTP Tasks 1-2-2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Tables--2016-2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 - NEW - KPTP Tasks 3-4 - 2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Tables--2016-2017.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Scoring Guide - Electronic Portfolio.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Tables--22016-2017.doc](#)

[Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)

[Assessment 6 Data Tables--2016-2017.doc](#)

[BSE Physical Education - Curriculum Guide.doc](#)

[Assessment 6 Scoring Guide-Unit Analysis.doc](#)

[ESU KSDE Physical Education Report.docx](#)

Program Name: Recreation BS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The Recreation BS program has transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan and is now being reported in this new assessment plan template.

AY 2017

Recreation is working to make many changes within the program. The following have been worked on in the 2016-2017 academic year:

1. Made adjustments to the disposition form to better evaluate/assess the students within Recreation
2. Implemented disposition assessments in two classes earlier in the program
3. Re-evaluated the program assessment of an exit survey start implementing it again.

Along with the other programs, Recreation will have the HPER Undergraduate program review their 2016-2017 annual data in order to make suggestions for improvement. This will take place over the 2017-2018 academic year and will be submitted May 2018.

AY 2016

Attached is the Recreation annual report compiled and evaluated. Based on the assessment data gathered and information provided in the report, the faculty has made the following changes:

1. During the 2013-2014 school year, the Recreation program went through a program review through both a focus group and an external reviewer. The findings from the external reviewer in spring 2014 were addressed by the Recreation Program Review committee. The entire program was changed during the 2014-2015 school year. Starting in Fall 2015, new courses and program requirements were in place. Starting Fall 2016, new assessments will be in place and clearly identified.
2. Specific to assessments: Now that new curriculum has been established, we will identify assessments throughout the program and not just those that are in the senior year of the program. We will evaluate the curriculum map done for Recreation program to indicate possible places for assessments to be identified. This will not only give a larger view of the program, but also identify progression and improvement of students in those areas.

Attached Files

[Recreation Program Data 20153-20155-20161](#)

[TTC-HP-RECREATION-BS](#)

[Recreation Program 2017 Annual Summary.doc](#)

[Recreation Program Assessment Data 2013-2014](#)

[Recreation Annual Report 2013-2014](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

During the 2018 academic year, the faculty in the HPER department participated in course embedded assessments and reported their findings using the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Reporting tool. There were 28 separate course assessments submitted, of which 16 were dedicated to General Education assessment. The 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans were completed and faculty in year 2 courses entered their assessment information in the reporting tool as well. Faculty from the Recreation BS program assessed RC100, RC150, RC395, RC360 and RC430. Faculty in the Health and Human Performance BS program assessed HL150, HL570, and HL 580. For the Advanced HPER MS, the following courses were assessed and reported, PE738, PE865, PE720, PE864, and PE868.

This past year, the Physical Education BSE program completed the KSDE report submitted for review in October 2017. The details of the change strategies are outlined in Section V of the report and there are 5-areas of focus in the most recent review including the 5-year review

of all courses to confirm the integrity of the curriculum, changing PE365 to 2-hour blocks to expand applied learning, focus on the student growth and development topic in the electronic portfolio, transitions to the KPTP, and implementation of the new EPP disposition tool.

The Athletic Training program continues its transition from a bachelor to a master program of study. This transition will entail building any new assessment practices into the existing plan and as aligned with the specialized accrediting entity. Be prepared to include both course and program evaluation and planning the assessments into the initial curriculum will be beneficial.

Both the Health and Human Performance and the Recreation BS programs will be working toward expanding their assessment efforts to include those courses listed in the year 3 of the 5-year plans. The Health and Human Performance program may need to review the curriculum map and ensure that all of the program student learning objectives and/or course learning outcomes will need to be updated.

It is anticipated that the Advanced HPER MS may be charged to bring the program into the CAEP and KSDE standards. It was once believed that the advanced programs wouldn't be a part of the KSDE-CAEP required assessment practices, however it appears that this may not be the case after all. The MS program had transitioned to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Plan, but this may need readjustment as well depending on the CAEP situation. This is in a holding pattern right now.

The participation of the faculty in assessment practices is greatly appreciated! Keep up the good work, and I'm always available to assist in these assessment processes. Workshops are offered on a variety of assessment topics and faculty are encouraged to attend. Thanks again for all your efforts and expertise!

Academic Year 2017

The HPER department has made some strategic changes to their assessment practices over the past academic year. The changes from the NCATE to CAEP accreditation is a work in progress and will likely be ongoing through the 2018 reporting cycle and 2019 site visit. The assessment reports for each of the major programs are up to date and include key improvement strategies at the individual course/outcome levels and in processes where faculty group committees are serving a more comprehensive role in the overall assessment processes. This change in and of itself will create a more robust assessment culture and will allow for continuous faculty collaboration in implementing student learning improvement strategies. The assessment and reporting of the general education courses (HL150 and PE100) is greatly appreciated and the existing reporting structure in place is appropriate to the instructor assignments. With the change in department chair leadership, this is an area of assessment reporting that may need to be revisited as the chair took a lead role in accumulating and reporting assessment data for these courses. The strategy was that faculty and GTA's would report assessment information for their courses to the chair and the chair would assemble the data and report it multiple times to account for faculty individually and GTA's comprehensively. The assessment of all general education courses is an institutional priority at this time so you will want to be able to continue these assessment reporting contributions. The Program 5-Year Assessment Review Cycle plans will benefit those programs that are not under specialized accreditation standards. There is still some work that needs to be done in setting up these assessment cycles and based on our last individual meeting the plan was to meet with faculty groups for the specific programs at the beginning of the semester and work out the details of the courses that will be identified for course-embedded assessments for the individual programs for this upcoming year and for subsequent years of the assessment cycles. Please let me know when you have completed this work in the 5-Year Plan templates. It is important to inform faculty as soon as you can to let them know that they can expect to assess and report their courses in this academic year. The assessment practices the department has in place have been beneficial to the continuous improvement of student learning experiences for the programs. The Program 5-Year Assessment Cycle Plans will provide additional coordination to assessment activities for the Health Promotion, Recreation, and Advanced PE Masters degrees. These assessment practices will maintain a process of continuous improvement in the student learning experience and keep the overall curriculum current as well. I look forward to working with the department's faculty and leadership, keep up the teamwork in your assessment endeavors! Thanks for all you do!

Academic Year 2016

Overall, the assessment planning and operations for the entire department are concise and very well aligned with ensuring that graduates are receiving a high quality education and where applicable are completing certification and licensure successfully. The strategies that are going to be implemented for next year evidence the excellent work of faculty in using assessment results to improve individual assignments and courses. Engaging your faculty in the way that you do to coordinate assessment review efforts is awesome! Your assessment plans for the Health Promotion and Recreation programs look very solid. The way that you have aligned assessments and the three-year tracking models in place are best practices. The curriculum mapping exercises ensure that the curricula are current and that your assessments are planned throughout the curriculum. It will benefit programs to not only look at the completed candidates work, but to take a deep dive look into how each course contributes to the learning outcomes. You will want to narrow and prioritize a select few courses each year to implement lower level course assessments. However, as you work your way through the curriculum plan to incorporate a look at all courses over time, it may help to develop a cycle of courses to be assessed every 3rd year or so. This way, faculty are aware that their courses are a part of a cycle of assessment. This is beneficial for a couple reasons, one it helps all faculty be on the same page with how their specific courses contribute to

the curriculum and for those instances where you have faculty turnover, it gives new faculty a chance to learn more about how the curriculum fits together cohesively. The HPER assessment model is to be commended, it is a perfect example how each program uses assessment as a way to continuously improve the student learning experience and to ensure that graduates have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be successful professionals.

Academic Year 2015

The department's assessment plan and overall program are sound. The specific description and detail of what each program is focusing on was completed with precision. You are making all the right connections between assessments and areas in which you want to see student learning improve. The alignment between the athletic training competencies and the athletic training certification scores should improve over the course of the next few years as the changes made to curriculum and addition of faculty will show up on test scores. The program assessments for the undergraduate health and physical education BSE show that those students completing the programs are faring well on PRAXIS examinations for licensure. Attention to enhancing students experiences with different populations including more adaptive experiences is good. Increased reflection assignments and practical experiences are best practices. Integrating more of these experiences into the curriculum is a great strategy as both confirm a more effective learning experience for students. The Health Promotion program is going strong and the Recreation Program is poised to take student learning to the next levels. I really like the emphasis on writing in the discipline and mastery of writing skills. These skills will enable students to advance more quickly in their professions. I see writing skills as a weakness across many disciplines, so kudos for keeping it up front and center on the radar. Continue to work on enhancing those experiences for students in general education courses as these entry level courses can have a great impact on student success. You have a good mentoring program set up for graduate teaching assistants, keep this on your radar as well. Overall, your department's assessment program is to be commended. Keep up the great work!

Providing Department: Health, Physical Education and Recreation

Responsible Roles: Paul Luebbers (E10287157), Matthew Howe (E10000778), Joan Brewer (E10000569), Shawna Shane (E10088245)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Advanced Health, Physical Education & Recreation MS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Years One-Four

- Review curriculum map.
- Assess how the following core class relates to how the Course Assessments coordinate with the course Student Learning Outcomes, as well as the HPER graduate program outcomes.
 - PE 865-Statistics in HPER

Summary 2018

PE 865: Statistics in HPER

Measuring Student Learning and Findings:

I used a homework assignment where students were required to perform a statistical analysis in SPSS and submit the data and output for the analysis. I found that over half of the students submitted work that was essentially perfect with respect to the requirements, but that 7 submissions included at least one or more substantial deficits. The assignment requirements included 6 requirements (some of which included multiple analyses) and a data file. If one or more required elements were missing or incorrect, this was considered to be a deficit and the overall score was reduced accordingly.

Strategies to Improve Student Learning:

Based on the patterns observed during assessment (which analyses were most often incorrect or incomplete) I modified the training and support for the next session of the class. This included modifying the written instructions for the assignment and also re-recording the tutorial videos on these topics using narrated Kaltura screen captures. I will compare the next sessions outcome with this one to gauge the effectiveness of the strategy.

Attached Files

[TTC-HP-HEALTH PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION NON THESIS-MS](#)

[TTC-HP-HEALTH PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION THESIS-MS](#)

[Battenfield-Andy-PE738-SP18.pdf](#)

[Butler-Michael-PE865-SP18.pdf](#)

[Fitzpatrick-Robert-PE720-FA17.pdf](#)

[Fitzpatrick-Robert-PE864-SP18.pdf](#)

[Mehrhof-Joella-PE868-SP18.pdf](#)

[Pfannenstiel-Keith-PE868-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:Year Two

- Assess how the following core classes relate to how the Course Assessments coordinate with the course Student Learning Outcomes, as well as the HPER graduate program outcomes.
 - PE 707-Applied Psychology in HPER
 - PE 868-Project in HPER
 - PE 869-Thesis

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:Year Three

- Assess how the following core classes relate to how the Course Assessments coordinate with the course Student Learning Outcomes, as well as the HPER graduate program outcomes.
 - PE 738-Advanced Technology in HPER
 - PE 768-Advanced Exercise Physiology
 - PE 858-Ethics in HPER and Sport

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:Year Four

- Assess the elective classes within the program for their relationship to HPER graduate program outcomes and continued relevance.
 - PE 715-History of Sport and Politics
 - PE 720-Assessment in K-12 Physical Education
 - PE 725-Art and Science of Coaching
 - PE 740-Legal Issues in HPER
 - PE 745- Leadership in HPER
 - PE 762-Analysis of Teaching and Coaching
 - PE 803-Motor Learning
 - PE 804-Biomechanics
 - PE 835-Teaching Online Health & PE
 - PE 840-Exercise Metabolism
 - PE 862-Instructional Innovations in PE
 - PE 864-Sociology of Sport
 - HL710-Advanced Critical Issues in Health
 - HL720-Curriculum Development in Health Education
 - HL735-Instructional Strategies in Human Sexuality Education
 - HL780-School Health Issues and Trends
 - HL800-Applied Risk Behavior Education and Strategies
 - HL820-Instructional Methods in Health Education
 - HL850-Wellness Concepts and Prevention Strategies

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:Year Five

Write Executive Summary showcasing each of the assessment practices, findings, strategies for change, and accomplishments from the previous four years.

Providing Department: HPER MS

Responsible Roles: Paul Luebbers (E10287157), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Health and Human Performance BS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

Year One

Capstone Classes covered Annually

- Review all course requirements & Curriculum Guide
- HL570: Practicum II in Health Promotion
- HL580: Internship in Health Promotion

Academic Year 2018 Summary

Individual Course Assessment Reports were as follows:

HL570: Practicum II in Health Promotion

To measure student learning in this course, we examined: 1) Professional portfolio consisting of two essays (one regarding their Professional Development experiences and one regarding their work with diverse populations), a cover letter and resume, pictures of their Professional Development experiences, and a collection of their work samples throughout their coursework. 2) A 50 hour performance review (of work hours completed outside of class). 3) A mock interview conducted by Career Services. Based on the results no changes were necessary at this time.

HL580: Internship in Health Promotion

To measure student learning for this "Internship" course, we used data provided on an evaluation form completed by their supervisor for their 480 hours of on-site work. This form had their supervisors assess their "content knowledge", their "communication and technologies" abilities, their "professional behavior", their "administrative/managerial" abilities, their ability to utilize "diverse resources", their ability to implement "effective programming", and whether or not they complied with all legal and ethical protocol throughout their experience. Based on the results no changes were necessary at this time.

Attached Files

[TTC-HP-HEALTH PROMOTION-BS](#)

[Avery-Amy-HL150-SP18.pdf](#)

[Hodges-Kendra-HL150-SP18.pdf](#)

[Johnson-Andrew-HL150-SP18.pdf](#)

[Matthews-Katie-HL150-FA17.pdf](#)

[Matthews-Katie-HL150-SP18.pdf](#)

[Pfannenstiel-Keith-HL150-SP18.pdf](#)

[Redeker-Emily-HL150-SP18.pdf](#)

[Pfannenstiel-Keith-HL150-FA17.pdf](#)

[Hodges-Kendra-HL150-FA17.pdf](#)

[Redeker-Emily-HL150-FA17.pdf](#)

[Thomas-Jennifer-HL570-SP18.pdf](#)

[Thomas-Jennifer-HL580-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Year Two

- HL150: Critical Health Issues
- HL155: First Aid & Personal Safety

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year Three

- HL344: Modifying Health Behavior
- HL355: Health Promotion Protection Mgmt.
- HL465: Worksite Wellness Programs
- HL524: Ergogenic Issues in HPER
- HL566: Exercise Testing & Prescription
- HL250: Introduction to Health Promotion
- PE266: Technology in HPER

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:**Year Four**

- HL370: Practicum I in Health Promotion
- HL565: Strategies in Health Promotion
- HL356: Health Fitness Instruction & Leadership
- PE360: Physiology of Exercise
- PE362: Kinesiology
- GB385: Nutrition
- HL435: Strength & Conditioning for the Personal Trainer

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:**Year Five**

- Review updates based on previous course reviews and focus groups
- Review program outcomes and Curriculum Guide

Providing Department: Health Promotion BS

Responsible Roles: Paul Luebbbers (E10287157), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1**Recreation BS**

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:**Year One through Four**

- Review all course requirements and Curriculum Guide
- RC451: Professional Development in Recreation
- RC570: Internship in Recreation

Summary 2018**RC451 Professional Development in Recreation**

Setting the baseline for the student success metrics, three-year trend data from 2016-2018 shows that 46 students completed the course with 41 (89%) exceeding expectations, 3 (7%) meeting expectations, and 2 (4%) not meeting expectations.

RC570 Internship in Recreation

Since 2016, there has been 15 successful program internship completers with 100% exceeding expectations. It is common for interns to have quality applied learning experiences in the field of recreation. These placements vary widely and are closely aligned with student career interests. We will continue to monitor the required documentation, supervisor reviews, and assignments to identify strategies to improve the internship experience.

Attached Files

[TTC-HP-RECREATION-BS](#)

[Longacre-Clinton-RC150-SP18.pdf](#)

[Longacre-Clinton-RC395-SP18.pdf](#)

[Slater-Whitney-RC360-SP18.pdf](#)

[Longacre-Clinton-RC100-FA17.pdf](#)

[Longacre-Clinton-RC430-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Year Two

- RC100: Introduction to Recreation
- RC150: Foundations of Recreation Activities
- RC395: Practicum I in Recreation
- RC360: Facility Management in Recreation

Summary 2018

RC100: Introduction to Recreation

Four Exams: Exams were used to measure the students understanding of the theory aspect of the course. Two Special Topic Papers: The papers were utilized to encourage the students to further explore the subject areas in which they have the highest interest. Five Multimedia Assignments: The multimedia assignments were made to further expand the students knowledge of selected subject areas and the professional organizations most closely associated with those areas of parks and recreation. Guest Speaker Reflection Papers: Guest speakers were park and recreation professionals who were selected because of their expertise in the areas of parks and recreation that related most closely with the interest areas of most of the students in the class. This aspect of the class is adjusted each semester to meet the highest interest areas of the students. The students were required to write a reflection paper on the content of the information presented by the guest speakers. This proved to be very effective in helping the students new to parks and recreation to better understand the total park and recreation profession. Based on the findings, no changes are necessary at this time.

RC150: Foundations of Recreation Activities

Exams were used to measure the students understanding of the theory aspect of the course. Performance: Individual and Team Presentations in class, for campus activities, and at community events were used to evaluate the pragmatic aspect of the students learning process. Findings: A combination of theory, practice, and performance expectations proved to be very effective. Detailed individual leadership and team presentation evaluation forms were utilized along with follow up verbal evaluations to assess the effectiveness of the learning process. Based on the findings, no changes are necessary at this time.

RC395: Practicum I in Recreation

Written Reports: Each week a report was submitted concerning the prior weeks activities and other observations during the students practicum experience. The reports were well written. Oral Reports: Each week the student would give an oral report concerning the subjects covered in their written report. The oral reports were well expressed. Supervisors Evaluation: At the conclusion of the practicum experience the students site supervisor submitted the student's evaluation form. Based on the findings, no changes are necessary at this time.

RC360: Facility Management in Recreation

Test, reports. This semester my class was a second block class because the first block I was on maternity leave, so the material covered was accelerated. We had two exams. The first exam the class averaged an 85% and the second exam the average was an 84%, so I was very pleased with this outcome on both exams. I felt test scores reflected knowledge of the material. The students were also required to do a series of site tour reports throughout the block. As the semester progressed, the reports started getting more in-depth and more of the content that we were covering in class was starting to show up in their reports. Student Learning Improvement Strategies include editing my rubric for my site tour reports to give the students better feedback. My current rubric is pretty vague, so adding some more details to the rubric would help provide students with more meaningful feedback. There was also four questions that came from the same chapter on the final exam that 75% of the class missed, so I am going to incorporate a new way of presenting this chapter next year by having more peer to peer discussions. We will also be spending more time covering this material, since it seemed to cause the most confusion.

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year Three

- RC270: Sport Management

- RC389: Program Design & Promotion in Recreation
- RC401: Aquatic Management
- RC430: Leadership & Management in Recreation

Summary 2019

RC430: Leadership & Management in Recreation

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

Year Four

- RC470: Practicum II in Recreation
- RC374: Recreation Delivery Systems

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Year Five

- Review updates based on previous course reviews and focus groups
- Review program outcomes and Curriculum Guide

Providing Department: Recreation BS

Responsible Roles: Paul Luebbers (E10287157), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

UNIT REPORT

Instructional Design and Technology Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/19/18, 2:03 PM

**Instructional Design and Technology Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY2015-2018**

The assessment planning for the IDT department doesn't vary from year to year as we have three specific programs that we assess and the variability can occur at the program level. These strategies and findings are reported in the specific program reporting areas. In a typical year, the department evaluates each of the 2 graduate programs and 1 undergraduate licensure program. Each program has developed assessment points, gathers data from those completed assessments, compiles the data into tables, analyzes the results to make goals for change in the future, and summarizes the information in a report. The Instructional Design and Technology (IDT) and Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) programs annually submit these reports to KSDE in the required format.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2015-2018**

As a department, both programs follow the required KSDE reporting formats and will continue this process indefinitely. Annually, both programs also conduct program level focus group studies every three years and submit these reports to The Teachers College Deans office.

Attached Files

[Program Review Indicators - IDT 2016](#)[Program Review Indicators - IDT 2015](#)[Program Review Indicators - IDT 2016](#)[Program Review Indicators - IDT 2017](#)[Program Review Indicators - IDT 2018](#)**Program Name :** Instructional Design and Technology MS**Summary of Program Assessments:****AY 2018**

Attached is the Masters of Science in Instructional Design and Technology program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2017-2018 include:

- Discussed and created block schedule for Online MS in IDT; starting Fall 2018, students can earn degree in 3 semesters
- Completed CAEP Technology Report
- Completed plans to implement Biometric Lab
- Made significant efforts to increase social media and program marketing

The IDT Program Annual Report lists in section V the following change strategies to advance the program and improve the student learning experience.

Based on the candidate performance on assessments, several curriculum changes (within courses) are anticipated:

- 1) Because of ever-changing software version changes, the anchor applications in IT810 Multimedia Design will be changed and/or updated to include appropriate multimedia authoring software.
- 2) Due to difficulties with mastering Flash in IT810, the faculty decided to have candidates concentrate on how to effectively develop and integrate media in developing a media project.
- 3) Textbook and software requirements for candidates taking IT810 will be updated to match new course outcomes and materials.

- 4) All courses will have a greater emphasis on writing and appropriate APA style.
- 5) Due to some difficulty in locating and retrieving resources for IT 800 and IT 899, more emphasis will be given to locating and retrieving online research articles through the ESU library.
- 6) IT 820 Designing/Developing Web-Based Instruction will be updated to take into consideration the latest advances in web-based and e-learning tools.
- 7) Because of the need for stronger backgrounds in teaching and learning and because there is an increased number of candidates with non-education backgrounds in the program, PY805/PY811 were added as core courses for the program.
- 8) Instructional Design principles from IT800 Instructional Design were fully integrated into the master's project and paper.
- 9) The structure of IT 899 Master's Project was changed to enable candidates to spend more time and resources on the actual project itself, instead of writing a paper.
- 10) To emphasize multimedia design and development skills, a Flash movie presentation and brochure replaced the original PowerPoint presentation in the Master's Project.
- 11) To ease uploading and prompt feedback, IT 899 Master's Project videos were adapted to YouTube format and uploaded to YouTube.
- 12) LI 813 was dropped as a core requirement from the program and outcomes were addressed in IT 710.
- 13) Due to some difficulties by candidates and analysis and design, more attention will be given to the analysis and design stages of instructional design in IT 800.
- 14) Based upon trends, it appears that an increasing number of candidates are encountering problems completing their master's project during their intended semesters (sometimes due to physical/emotional or family issues of which faculty have no control). However, more attention will be given to advising, so that candidates can make smart enrollment decisions (number of credits per semester, semester load, taking work and family into consideration).
- 15) All course program changes (such as new courses and titles) must be approved by the IDT faculty, the Committee on Advanced Programs, the Academic Leadership Council, and are then forwarded for university approval.

For the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting tool the following information was provided by faculty:

IT360: Instructional Technology for Secondary Educators

Fall 2017 Term

The students created an ePortfolio of their projects during the course. This ePortfolio contains evidence of their work as well, it can be used to promote themselves in the future as they seek a teaching job. To improve student learning: There was one specific activity using iMovie that required the use of classroom computers. The students needed to work on the project outside of class and next semester, I plan to use a different software that better allows for collaboration.

Spring 2018 Term

The course uses mostly project-based learning strategies and culminates with an ePortfolio project completed throughout the course. 91% of the students either met or exceeded the expectations on the ePortfolio. One of the students who did not meet expectations was absent more often than present and failed the course due to multiple missing assignments. The other student worked hard throughout the course and sought assistance on many projects because the technology was challenging for him. He met expectations in many other projects/assignments but was missing critical elements of the final ePortfolio. His final grade was a C and would be considered meeting expectations when considering the course as a whole. To improve student learning: When areas of difficulty become clear, I provide additional support or clarification. When technology does not work as anticipated, the expectations are adjusted. I look forward to implementing more strategies that will meet the Quality Matters rubric for course design.

IT325: Instructional Technology for Educators

Fall 2017 Term

The course uses projects, quizzes, essays, reports, research, online portfolios, discussions to measure student learning. To improve student learning: Since I teach an online course, after most modules I edit the directions and assignments and add and refine the tutorials as needed. I also create student evaluations that are given to my students once or twice a semester for feedback to assist me in revamping the course for the next semester. I ask for student feedback normally once or twice a semester to help me refine my lessons for the next semester. The survey is optional, but worth extra credit points.

AY 2017

Attached is the Masters of Science in Instructional Design and Technology program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2016-2017 include:

- Created Teaching with Technology Graduate Certificate
- Completed plans to revamp VH124 into a MakerSpace/Multimedia Lab
- Aligned assessments with ISTE Standards across IDT undergraduate classes
- Graduated first IDT Thesis student
- Mentored Student Team who won Overall Winner of the 2016 AECT Design and Development Competition

AY 2016

Attached is the Masters of Science in Instructional Design and Technology program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2015-2016 include:

- Explore the restructuring and renovation of VH124 to allow for a makerspace and digital media development space
- Implemented a technology and infrastructure plan to provide a more innovative learning space for VH122
- Updated course names and course numbers to reflect current trends in the Instructional Design and Technology field

AY 2015

Attached is the Masters of Science in Instructional Design and Technology program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2014-2015 include:

- Added a new eLearning and Online Teaching graduate certificate to accommodate students wanting to learn how to teach online.
- Create a client-student partnership for the IT899 Masters Project course to allow students to get experience working with a professional in the field and to bridge that transition between being a student and becoming a professional in the field.
- Create a Thesis option for students wanting a research focus and increasing preparation for entering a doctoral program.

Attached Files

- [Attachment 2.1](#)
- [Attachment 2.2](#)
- [Attachment 3.1](#)
- [Attachment 3.2](#)
- [Attachment 4.1](#)
- [Attachment 4.2](#)
- [Attachment 5.1](#)
- [Attachment 5.2](#)
- [Attachment 6.1](#)
- [Attachment 6.2](#)
- [Attachment 7.1](#)
- [Attachment 7.2](#)
- [Attachment 7.1](#)
- [Attachment 2.1](#)
- [Attachment 2.2](#)
- [Attachment 5.2](#)
- [Attachment 5.1](#)
- [Attachment 7.2](#)
- [Attachment 6.1](#)
- [Attachment 6.2](#)
- [Attachment 4.2](#)
- [Attachment 4.1](#)
- [Attachment 3.2](#)
- [Attachment 3.1](#)
- [TTC-IDT-INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN AND TECHNOLOGY-MS](#)
- [IDT Annual Report 2016](#)
- [IDT Annual Report 2017](#)
- [Attachment 2.1](#)
- [Attachment 2.2](#)
- [Attachment 3.1](#)
- [Attachment 3.2](#)
- [Attachment 4.1](#)

- [Attachment 4.2](#)
- [Attachment 5.1](#)
- [Attachment 5.2](#)
- [Attachment 6.1](#)
- [Attachment 6.2](#)
- [Attachment 7.1](#)
- [Attachment 7.2](#)
- [IDT Annual Report 2015](#)
- [Attachment 2.1.docx](#)
- [Attachment 2.2.docx](#)
- [Attachment 3.1.docx](#)
- [Attachment 3.2.docx](#)
- [Attachment 4.1.docx](#)
- [Attachment 5.1.docx](#)
- [Attachment 6.1.docx](#)
- [Attachment 5.2.docx](#)
- [Attachment 4.2.docx](#)
- [Attachment 6.2.docx](#)
- [Attachment 7.1.docx](#)
- [Attachment 7.2.docx](#)
- [IDT Annual Report 2017.pdf](#)
- [D'Souza-Jonathan-IT371-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Duggan-Kristy-IT360-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Duggan-Kristy-IT360-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Howell-Deanne-IT325-FA17.pdf](#)

Program Name: TESOL MA

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

Attached is the Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2017-2018 AY include:

- Filled the open Associate Professor and Program Coordinator position in TESOL
- Started discussions on creating an International Program for TESOL

Section V of the KSDE report identifies the use of assessment results to improve candidate and program performance. the following information was contained in section V of the most recent 2017 report.

Data assessment results from assessments 1-8 reported above show that program completers' average mean scores in all eight direct measures were 92% in 2014-2015, 93% for 2015-2016, and 90% for 2016-2017, with a cut-off score of 75% or higher. The three years' (2014-2017) average mean score for all assessments was 92%. The passing rate of completion in all eight direct measures was 93% in 2014-2015, 98% for 2015-2016, and 96% for 2016-2017. The three years' (2014-2017) average completion rate was 96%. This provides evidence that program completers met all KSDE ESOL teacher preparation Standards 1-10. Furthermore, indirect measures, such as exit interview data and follow-up studies, will continue to be used and triangulated with aggregated data from other program assessment sources (namely, assessment techniques 1-8 reported above). This triangulation of data, collected from previous published follow-up studies (e.g. Sehlaoui & Albrecht, 2009, 2011), provide additional evidence of the effectiveness of the ESOL teacher education program.

Assessment results will continue to be used to provide more resources (including professional development resources such as books and videotapes of best practices and PRAXIS Study Guides) and support (e.g. incorporating TESOL TWS in the methods class and offering immediate and specific feedback on candidates' performance for improvement) to help candidates develop their knowledge and skills in this field. Candidates who may not meet program criteria of success are advised to use these resources, practice using the study guides, and utilize the specific feedback provided to them by program faculty. The resources are sent to ESU's WAW library and the Teachers College Resource Center and are made available to both pre-service and in-service teachers.

Since most program completers met standards with a 75% performance, the following strategies will continue be used to maintain the performance level at a cut-off score of 75%:

- Continue to support program candidates to develop their lesson planning skills and their linguistic competence and knowledge in the area of

applied linguistics and TESOL and align assessment techniques with standards for more triangulation to make the program assessment system stronger. This strategy will provide more evidence to corroborate program assessment findings.

- Continue to provide candidates with more resources and assistance to improve their performance, especially in the area of applied linguistics.
- Continue to encourage faculty to collaborate among each other and share feedback on program improvement.
- Continue to provide candidates with faculty modeling of best practices and immediate and specific feedback to attain the target performance level.
- Continue to conduct frequent evaluations of new assessment techniques by faculty to improve their validity and reliability, based on information and feedback received from multiple direct and indirect assessment measures used in the program.
- Continue to conduct follow-up studies to identify areas for improvements from program candidates who completed the program after every two years. Previous follow-up studies conducted by program director and other faculty members in the program and the federal ESL grants showed evidence of the effectiveness of the TESOL Teacher Education program at ESU (See for example Sehlaoui & Shinge, 2013; Sehlaoui & Albrecht, 2011; Sehlaoui & Albrecht, 2009; Sehlaoui, Seguin, & Kreicker, 2005). Based on exit interview data and program completers' feedback, a common theme emerged that called for more technology resources to enhance the delivery of online courses.

Assessment data results from annual assessment reports and follow-up studies will continue to be shared with program candidates and all program faculty members. This will continue to contribute to the quality of the candidates and the effectiveness of program performance.

Finally, it should be noted here that only 14% of total candidates enrolled completed the program in 2016-2017. The total number of candidates enrolled during this reporting period was 49. Only 7 of these completed the program. This is due to the test-only option/policy that the state continues to offer for both pre-service and in-service teachers. It seems that the majority of candidates take one or two content courses in preparation for the PRAXIS Exam only and then drop the program. They opt for taking the test instead of completing their coursework. To address this situation, TESOL Teacher Education faculty members conducted a research study that provided scientific evidence that the test-only policy is ineffective and does not serve the needs of English learners (see Sehlaoui & Shinge (2013) for more details). Results from the study and from this assessment report were shared with candidates through advising and during their coursework to encourage them to complete the entire program and obtain their licensure through quality coursework instead of the test-only option. This tendency among candidates, based on data assessment, has unfortunately continued to grow over the years. In 2012-2013 year the percent of program completers was 27%. In 2015-2016 that number decreased to 10%. This continues to be an alarming situation in the field and we hope policymakers will address this situation to do justice to k-12 students who are exposed to educators who lack the professional training.

AY 2017

Attached is the Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2016-2017 AY include:

- Revised the elective options in the curriculum in order to address student needs
- Submitted several grants to support teachers seeking TESOL endorsement

AY 2016

Attached is the Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2015-2016 AY include:

- Dr. Sehlaoui and Dr. Shinge worked on the Follow-up study for program review and improvement purposes.
- Submitted several grant applications

AY 2015

Attached is the Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages program annual report as it was compiled and submitted to KSDE. Accomplishments for the 2014-2015 AY include:

- Added a Graduate TESOL Certificate
- Made changes to TS790XA (Computer-Assisted Language Learning & Teaching)
- Moved TS735XA and TS735ZA entirely online
- Added fees to cover practicum visits and scoring of TESOL TWS
- Explored a TESOL Guatemalan Partnership Program
- Dr. Sehlaoui and Dr. Shinge started planning for the next Follow-up study for program review and improvement purposes.

Attached Files

 [Assessment 2 Rubric](#)

 [Assessment 3 Rubric](#)

- [Assessment 4 Rubric A](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric B](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric A](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric B](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric A](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric B](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric C](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 1](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 1](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 2](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 1](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 2](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 3](#)
- [TESOL Annual Report](#)
- [TTC-IDT-TESOL-MS](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric A](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric B](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric A](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric B](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric A](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric B](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric C](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 1](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 1](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 2](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 1](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 2](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 3](#)
- [TESOL Annual Report](#)
- [TESOL Program Annual Assessment Report 2016-2017.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table .doc](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 1.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 1.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 2.docx](#)

- [Assessment 7 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 1.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 3.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric A.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric B.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric B.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric A.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric A.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric B.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric C.doc](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table .doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 1.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 1.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table 2.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 1.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Data Table 3.doc](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric A.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric B.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric A.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric B.doc](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric A.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric B.doc](#)
- [Assessment 8 Rubric C.doc](#)
- [TESOL Annual Report](#)
- [Song-Heegyong-TS532-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Song-Heegyong-TS700-SP18.pdf](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

In reviewing the annual report for the IDT program, it is evident that your faculty are assessing student learning using an advanced infrastructure and identifying where change strategies will most positively impact the program. The structural alignment for courses and assignments with standards and learning goals is serving the role of informing the faculty on where to prioritize change strategies. There have been many change strategies employed to advance the program and the student learning experience such as adding courses, removing a course, changing software used in the flash project, streamlining some of the processes by adding in application assignments to replace writing assignments. You may want to use this 2019 academic year to monitor the impact on the students' ability to complete the course curriculum in an accelerated format. It will be important to use your course level (formative and summative) assessment data to identify any new learning barriers that students may be experiencing that haven't presented as such in the past. Since the entire program is now accelerated, you can work on navigating these new challenges holistically. It may take a few semesters to get the students assimilated into the new format, and after all students currently in the program have matriculated out, your challenges will probably lessen a bit. A positive is that you have a solid assessment structure in place. I'll be interested in reading your future IDT annual reports and learning about your

faculty adapt the curriculum and what new learning strategies are employed. The TESOL program faculty has worked extensively to ensure that completers are appropriately prepared and also have the educational resources available to continue to improve the student learning experience. It is a shame that students are only taking two courses then opting to take the Praxis test to obtain the certification. Hopefully, there will be some changes that can be made to encourage students to complete the entire curriculum. The faculty teaching general education courses related to undergraduate teacher preparation reported their assessment findings using the course level student learning outcomes assessment reporting tool. Please continue to encourage faculty to use this tool to report their course level assessments and to ensure that all courses making up the program curriculum are assessed over the 5-year assessment cycle. The assessment of all courses over time confirms student learning outcomes and the integrity of the course contribution to the program level learning outcomes/goals/objectives. Thank you for all of your assessment efforts and expertise!

Academic Year 2017

Another successful year for the IDT and TESOL programs. The annual assessment processes you have in place serve the department well and there has been an intentional approach to improve the student learning experiences through adaptations in learning spaces, alignments of assessments with International Society for Technology in Education standards, adaptations to pedagogy and curriculum changes, and continuous outcomes assessment for program completers. The high student success rates (completers) always above 90%+ on an annual basis are direct evidence of the effectiveness of the programs. One of the best ways to determine the quality of the program is to evidence the accomplishments of graduates and the IDT program continues to produce highly qualified award winning graduates (2016 AECT Design and Development Competition). The IT899 course and its embedded project dedicated to an internship-style experience is awesome. I have first hand experience of the value of this project for both the student and the client, as the project assisting the set-up of a Canvas course on assessment was a major success. The way the project assignment is designed provides a real-world experience and also allows to the student to gain knowledge and confidence in their abilities to accomplish and succeed external to the classroom. The creation of the 2015 Thesis option has come full-circle with the first graduate completing. It is hoped that in the near future the IDT doctoral program can continue its progression through the KBOR process for adding programs since this was an important strategy identified in the University's strategic plan. For the TESOL program, the acceptance of external grant funding would be welcomed, it is hoped that these proposals will be granted. Thank you for all of your assessment efforts and contributions to the betterment of student learning! Your assessment efforts and structured practices are greatly appreciated.

Academic Year 2016

The department has learned and implemented changes in their IDT and TESOL programs based on their assessment findings, respectively. TESOL has prepared students well, this is evidenced by meeting score thresholds on assessments and high percentages of students achieving success indicators. The Community Connections Projects have been valuable in connecting students with the greater good as linking what occurs in the classroom and how learning is impacted by cultural identity and diversity is of great importance. It is disheartening to read that some or many students are choosing to take only a couple of courses and then test to obtain licensure necessary for teaching appointments. Going forward it may be beneficial to see what other programs are doing to keep their students in the program through completion. It may be that their curriculum has prerequisites or courses are sequenced, so that the content courses needed to pass the licensure exam are last in the series of courses offered. Void of any changes in licensure exams and what is required before sitting for the exam, program completion appears to be in a downward trending spiral. It may be beneficial to identify a few key strategies to pursue to motivate students to complete the entire program. Wishing you well on your grant proposals. The IDT program continues to make solid strategic decisions based on their assessment data. The addition of the two courses (PY805 and PY811) to provide content knowledge for non-education backgrounds was a key strategy to employ. The client-student partnership in IT899 is a great way to provide students with a real world experience and to boost confidence in their abilities. It seems that the few students who did struggle with meeting 80% benchmarks did so due to language competencies and that this is an ongoing concern. Integrating the writing into the curriculum will help quite a bit, and identifying these students as early in a course as possible so he/she can be directed toward help services sooner rather than later may benefit success toward meeting benchmarks. Short assignments the first week of classes may benefit the identification of deficiencies. It is also mentioned that students struggle to complete high quality work in IT 899 due to not balancing the workload over the course of the semester. This is always a challenge for those courses with high workload like capstone projects and research assignments. Overall, the assessments and student success across both the IDT and TESOL programs are positive and informed decisions are being made to continuously improve student learning. The structure for assessing performance and recording of results is well designed. I noticed that having a portfolio tool is still desired, or is this from the inclusion of the assessment rubric comments section from previous reports? Just wondering, let me know where you stand on this e-portfolio subject. Your assessment work is greatly appreciated!

Academic Year 2015

The assessment plan for the Instructional Design and Technology department is sound for both of the programs (IDT and TESOL). The quality of the assessments are evidenced in the structure being used aligning with the Kansas Department of Education requirements. These assessments have led to both changes in the curriculum (adding in more written assignments using APA guidelines and adding and removing

courses) and pedagogies. Integrating technology into the teaching field has always been very dynamic as software and hardware evolve ever so quickly, oftentimes faster than a department can keep up with providing students with the newest technologies. I see this as one of the biggest challenges going forward, the affordability of staying at the forefront of the technology frontier. Also, the adoption of using technologies as an instructional medium is becoming more widely expected and at all ages of learning. It is fitting that the IDT department will serve a most unique niche in preparing teachers for using technologies in transforming learning. Be thinking about how to use assessment as that change driver that keeps the IDT program on the forefront, how will you maintain your strategic edge. Your assessment plan serves you well in determining if students are learning what you want them to, it may be beneficial to focus some assessment efforts on environmental scans and projecting program needs and growth out a few years (3-5) in preparation for the high paced changes that are occurring. Your current assessment plan is set up well to enhance student learning in a continuous cycle. The TESOL program is at a same crossroads place as the IDT program, with context being the difference. The need for teachers to have ESOL skills continues to grow.

Population demographic predictions show that the populations current teachers are serving are changing quite rapidly and the need for knowing how to connect with and teach students whose second language is English will continue to increase. A time will come when an ethnically diverse classroom will be the norm. The assessments being done in the TESOL program are outstanding with the recognition for areas of improvement being acted upon. It is unfortunate that grant funding dried up after such good support over 14 years, but the comment about having some of the TESOL courses adopted as requirements for education majors was spot on. The addition of certifications for both the IDT and TESOL programs were great moves. Continue to pursue the integration of the Technology and ESOL into the core requirements of education majors. Adoption may not occur as quickly as your would like, but the long and short of it is that both of these programs will fulfill a valuable contribution to teacher education preparation long term, it's inevitable. Keep assessing and keep pursuing your cause, great job!

Providing Department: Instructional Design and Technology

Responsible Roles: Zeni Colorado Resa (E10000037)

UNIT REPORT

Psychology Department Annual Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:45 AM

**Psychology Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

Ongoing assessment efforts included course-embedded assessments of general education courses, and submitting additional assessment information (i.e., a rejoinder) for the School Psychology program to close the 2017 report. Assessment cycle plans for the Clinical Psychology M.S., Industrial/Organizational Psychology M.S., and B.A./B.S. psychology degrees will be underway, with data available for analysis and decision-making. Focus groups with program completers will be reported for the Clinical and School Psychology programs. An overview of B.A./B.S. curricular mapping and program requirements have suggested curricular changes that will be enacted by year's end.

AY 2017

Ongoing Psychology department assessment efforts include course-embedded assessments of general education courses, assessing, analyzing, and completion of the KSDE report and affiliated assessments for the School Psychology MS/Ed.S. program. In addition, the National Association of School Psychologists accreditation report is due for submission for the School Psychology MS/Ed.S. program. The department faculty will also be engaged in transitioning to the 5-Year Program Assessment Cycle Plans for the Clinical Psychology MS, Industrial/Organizational Psychology MS, and Psychology BS/BA programs.

AY 2016

The Psychology department engaged in a curricular mapping exercise for all programs both undergraduate and graduate. Simultaneously, a change in institution policy required all syllabi to include student learning outcomes aligned with program learning outcomes. The department found this work to be informative and provided for the updating of the curriculum in some areas. The graduate faculty were fully engaged in compiling, analyzing and reporting assessment findings to complete the School Psychologist Report for the Kansas Department of Education (report and evidence files uploaded in file library for the respective program area).

AY 2015

Each year, the department evaluates its undergraduate program that includes three bachelors' degrees (BA, BS, BSE) and a minor as well its four graduate programs (Clinical, Experimental, Industrial/Organizational, and School). Each program has developed assessment areas, gathered data from those completed assessments, compiles the data, analyses the results, and uses that information to make future decisions so as to improve the program. Do to its nature, School Psychology also summarizes their information in accreditation reports for KSDE. Currently, all programs uses the PASL format as a basic template.

Start: 07/01/2015**End:** 06/30/2025**Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:****AY 2018**

There were multiple successes in our assessment practices over this past academic year. We made progress in faculty participation in the assessment of student learning outcomes in their courses. The instructors for the Introductory Psychology course participated in reporting their assessments in the course level student learning outcomes assessment reporting tool, meanwhile contributing to the general education assessment of critical thinking skills. This was year-three of the process using student works to score critical thinking skills to the AAC&U value rubric. For the Psychology program senior survey results, 89% of the graduates responded that the faculty provided effective teaching and instruction and an academically stimulating environment. Seventy-seven percent of graduates agreed or strongly agreed that Faculty was accessibly for out-of-class assistance and gave prompt feedback on assignments and tests.

Faculty reporting their course assessments as outlined in the 5-year assessment plans for the Clinical Psychology M.S., Industrial/Organizational Psychology M.S., and B.A./B.S. psychology degrees. Those findings are reported in the 5-year plan templates, respectively and the results files are uploaded in the file repositories. The rubrics for the Masters program in the Clinical Psychology program was reviewed and updated by program faculty, and will be used for review of the masters research projects and program learning objectives in the upcoming 2019 academic year in the capstone and thesis courses.

AY 2017

The Psychology department is positioning its assessment practices to align with the transitions to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plans for all programs except the Psychology BSE and the School Psychology MS/Eds program which are accredited through the Kansas Department of Education and follow highly structured program assessment and reporting requirements. Implementing the 5-year cycles will assist in engaging a larger number of faculty in the assessment process, provide structured course-embedded assessment of student learning, and provide for the review and revision of the program curriculum in each 5-year cycle. All of the 5-Year cycles have been determined including the division of courses for assessment in each of the 2-4 years, with the exception of the Industrial/Organizational Psychology MS program with is still working to complete this task.

AY 2016

The curriculum mapping exercise has raised some key questions about improving student learning in some respective programs. Getting the faculty involved in this process has been beneficial to conversations about course alignment and contribution to program level student learning outcomes. The undergraduate programs (BS, BA, & BSE) continue assessment efforts including the contributions of the PY100 Introductory Psychology course to the general education curriculum. There are some anticipated changes to occur with the transition from NCATE to CAEP, and the faculty are prepared to work to adapt to the transition; however the extent of these changes has yet to be confirmed. Due to the number of enrolled students, the Experimental Psychology MS program is under review for discontinuance.

AY 2015

As a department, all of the assessment plans begin with distinct learning outcomes for that program and then follow the basic PASL template. The department will be looking at moving from the PASL to newer model over the coming years with a focus on both 3 year and 5 year trends. The last PASL template to be used is listed below.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - PSYCHOLOGY 2014](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PSYCHOLOGY 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PSYCHOLOGY 2016](#)
- [General Education Critical Thinking Assessments 3-Year Report June 2015 - 2017](#)
- [Psychology Senior Survey Results](#)
- [Gen_Ed_Assessment_Report_Psychology](#)
- [PASL Template \(2013-2014\)](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PSYCHOLOGY 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - Psychology - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - PSYCHOLOGY 2018](#)

Program Name: Clinical Psychology MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

Upon completion of the accreditation report for the National Association of School Psychologists, the faculty of the Clinical Psychology MS program are transitioning into the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan and the courses and metrics for measuring student success have been identified as we begin assessing the courses and student success metrics as planned.

AY 2016

Learning Outcomes for the Clinical Psychology (MS) graduate program

1. Clinical Assessment:

Students will be familiar with the major assessment techniques and be able to competently use them. Students will be well versed in diagnostic systems (e.g., the recently updated DSM-V) as well as diagnostic issues.

2. Clinical Treatment:

Students will know and be able to competently implement a wide variety of psychological treatments, with particular emphasis on empirically supported treatments (ESTs). Students will also be knowledgeable about the limitations of ESTs, and have a solid understanding of the common factors that undergird all treatment approaches and understand the supporting research. Students will demonstrate basic mastery of helping skills prior to beginning internship.

3. Scientific Foundations:

Students will have thorough understanding of the scientific foundation of psychology.

4. Research:

Students will be able to evaluate the research of others and be able to design and implement their own research (research).

Attached Files

[Clinical Psychology PASL](#)

[TTC-PY-CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY-MS](#)

Program Name: Experimental Psychology MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

This program has been discontinued.

AY 2016

Learning Outcomes for the Experimental Psychology (MS) graduate program

1 Our students will demonstrate a broad knowledge base in psychology.

2 Our students will demonstrate the skills to be scientific and creative thinkers:

Doing a literature review that makes a cogent case for doing the thesis research

Articulating hypothesis and/or research question

Developing a research method for studying the hypothesis and/or research question

Collecting and analyzing the data

Developing appropriate conclusions

3 Our students will demonstrate the skills to be clear scientific writers:

Writing a literature review that makes a cogent case for doing the thesis research

Writing Method section for thesis research project

Writing Results section for thesis research project

Writing a coherent discussion

All writing follows current APA Publications Manual, the department writing standards and the thesis guide (<http://www.emporia.edu/psyspe/documents.htm>)

4 Our students will demonstrate the skills to be articulate presenters of scientific research

Orally presenting their thesis

5 Our students will demonstrate understanding of ethical standards in the use of human or animal participants.

6 Complete and submit an IRB or ACUC application that is subsequently approved

Attached Files

[📄 Experimental Psychology PASL](#)

Program Name: Industrial/Organizational Psychology MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2017

As of the end of the 2017 academic year, the I/O Psychology faculty are working on the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle Plan and will be completing the template and operationalizing the assessment strategies for the plan accordingly.

AY 2016

Learning Outcomes for the Industrial/Organizational Psychology (MS) graduate program

1 I/O Psychology Knowledge Base. Students will be able to demonstrate theoretical and content competencies and be knowledgeable about I/O Psychology jargon and terminology in the following content areas: Personnel Selection, Performance Appraisal, Training, Work Motivation, I/O Psychology Legal Issues, Work Attitudes, Leadership, and Organizational Issues.

2 Understanding of the Business World. Students will be knowledgeable about business terminology, practices, research, and graduate level business concepts related to Management, Human Resources, Communication, and Organizational Behavior.

3 Demonstration of Leadership and Professional Skills. Students will be able to effectively demonstrate and model skills related to leadership, professional conduct, continuous learning, interpersonal communication, teamwork, mentoring, and networking. Students will be actively involved in attending conferences, internships, practica, consulting endeavors, professional meetings, and psychology/business clubs, and be engaged in extracurricular activities that promote personal development.

4 Ethics & Diversity Appreciation. Students will be knowledgeable about psychology and business ethics. Students will understand how ethics and diversity issues impact the domestic and global workplace in the 21st century.

5 I/O Psychology Application Base. Students will be able to demonstrate application competencies in the following content areas:

Personnel Selection, Performance Appraisal, Training, Work Motivation, I/O Psychology Legal Issues, Work Attitudes, Leadership, Organizational Issues.

6 Presentational Skills. Students will be able to effectively present literature and data in a professional context before a group of peers using modern technology.

7 Research Orientation. Students will be able to demonstrate theoretical, content, and application competencies in statistics, psychometrics, and research design. Students will be able to effectively utilize PowerPoint, SPSS, and Excel for data analysis and presentations. Students will be able design, conduct, and write-up empirical research studies. Students will be able to analyze, critique, discuss, and integrate graduate level research literature.

Attached Files

[📄 TTC_PY_I_O_PSYCHOLOGY_MS](#)

[📄 I/O Program Report 2013](#)

[📄 I/O Psychology PASL](#)

[📄 Critical Thinking PY100 Assessment Report Fall 2017 and Spring 2018.pdf](#)

[📄 All PY100 Course Annual Assessment Reports Combined-AY18.pdf](#)

[📄 Arnold-Jackie-PY211-FA17.pdf](#)

[📄 Arnold-Jackie-PY211-SP18.pdf](#)

[📄 Grover-Cathy-PY301-SP18.pdf](#)

[📄 Belyea-Rodger-PY100-FA17.pdf](#)

[📄 Bradetich-Aaron-PY100-FA17.pdf](#)

[📄 Cyr-Kaitlin-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)

[📄 Carlson-Dani-PY100-FY17.pdf](#)

[📄 Grover-Cathy-PY401-SP18.pdf](#)

[📄 Klema-Alexandria-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)

[📄 Koehn-Clarie-PY100-AY18.pdf](#)

[📄 Koehn-Clarie-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)

[📄 McEnerney-Kelly-PY211-SP18.pdf](#)

[📄 Miller-Breyana-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)

[O'Brien-Megan-PY210-SP18.pdf](#)

[O'Brien-Megan-PY211-SP18.pdf](#)

[Swisher-Morgan-PY100-FA17.pdf](#)

[Swisher-Morgan-PY101-FA17.pdf](#)

[Wray-Anna-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name: Psychology BS/BA/BSE

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The KSDE program report for the Psychology BS/BSE was completed and submitted for review in October of 2017. Section V of the report is dedicated to using findings from assessment practices to implement student learning improvement strategies. The information contained in Section V is presented in support of the reporting for the degree program.

To become a high school psychology teacher in Kansas requires master of three standards. Standard 1 is "The teacher of psychology understands the major theoretical approaches, research finding, and historical trends in the science of psychology." The BSE Psychology program assesses content knowledge in five different ways including both standardized and performance assessments. Four of the five assessments present evidence clearly indicating that candidates know their content. And they should, having taken 24 hours of upper division psychology coursework in addition to Introduction to Psychology, Developmental Psychology, and Educational Psychology, which are all required for BSE majors.

For Assessment 2 (Teacher Work Sample Factors 1-4), Assessment 3 (Student Teacher Evaluation), Assessment 5 (the grade for PY401 Foundations of Psychology), and Assessment 6 (PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology) lesson plans, the candidates prepared materials in advance and were evaluated on their command of the materials they had put together to form a lesson and teach it. While there is an opportunity to study using the ETS Tests at a Glance pamphlet, it is minimal (18 sample test questions for a 100 item exam). Yet, candidates passed the Praxis II Exam and scored acceptably on all five subscales.

Standard 2 is "The teacher of psychology demonstrates an understanding of the use of major research methods in psychology, including design, data analysis, and interpretation." The first and most striking observation one makes when looking at the icon that represents the interrelationships among the five content domains which constitute the National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula is the centrality of Research Methods to psychological science. It is a real credit to Kansas that an entire standard is devoted to candidate preparation in this area, which is regarded by candidates and BS majors as the most rigorous and difficult part of the curriculum. The BSE Psychology program at Emporia State University takes very seriously that candidates not only possess the knowledge of research methods and statistics but have the skills necessary to do research so they can work with their students in encouraging, demonstrating, and mentoring good research performed ethically.

The program assesses this standard in two ways. First, the program uses the Research Methodology and Statistics subscore of the Praxis II Psychology Content Exam (Assessment 1a). Program completers in the 2009-2013 years scored 71% on this subscale. The second assessment is Assessment 7 The PY301 Experimental Research and Inferential Statistics Research Project Manuscript, the finished product of a semester-long dedicated effort on the part of both the student and the professor. It is a tribute to the program that a) all candidates complete two research courses (6 hours of credit), b) that students must earn at least a C in both courses, and c) students must complete a research project at the Acceptable level. Candidates are well prepared to "turn their students on" to psychological science.

Standard 3 is "The teacher of psychology applies the major theoretical approaches in psychology to reality-based personal, social, motivational, emotional, educational, and organizational issues." The program assesses candidate's ability to apply psychological content three ways: Assessment 3 (Student Teacher Evaluation), Assessment 4 (Teacher Work Sample Factors 1-4), and Assessment 6 (PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology Lesson Plans). These assessments emphasis application to educational issues more than the other five areas. Much of teaching and learning is psychology and the assessments provide good opportunities to evaluate whether candidates are using psychological principles to inform their lesson preparation. The evidence clearly indicates that candidates are adept in this area.

The evidence also clearly indicates that our candidates are not as strong applying psychology to the five other areas, especially Motivational and Organizational Issues. In working with the faculty about these data, most faculty indicate that they do include application of content knowledge in their courses, but that they would only typically include application to content knowledge that would be presented in that course. Since courses on Theories of Motivation and Industrial/Organizational Psychology are not part of the program, students might not have the content knowledge for application. Another perspective was the following: All candidates and majors know the Law of Effect--behavior followed by something pleasant tends to be repeated and behavior followed by something unpleasant tends not to be repeated. This is a foundational element of motivation. Candidates would recognize the law as the basis for smiley faces, checkmarks, and positive regard from the teacher improving student learning but may not see this recognition as applying psychology to motivational issues. Yet another perspective is that students may not have familiarity with application, may not have practiced applying psychology, or may not recognize when a faculty member is applying content knowledge even though they are exposed to the levels of Bloom's Taxonomy in both psychology and education courses. The program has implemented the following change to the program: presenting a lesson on application of psychological content knowledge in the PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology with copious examples and including an assignment

where candidates have to generate examples of applications in the six areas included in Standard 3.

Another change that the program has made speaks to the paucity of data and program completers. As noted, there is a lack of available data due to change in course instructors, program coordinators, and having small numbers. In 2016, the university hired an assistant professor with expertise in developmental psychology, as well as experience applying psychological principles in the delivery and planning of teaching seminars for future educators. Her experiences lend her uniquely qualified in matters of psychology and education. This faculty member has taken on the responsibilities of overseeing and mentoring students pursuing the BSE, assuring that they are aware of degree requirements and encouraging their pursuits. She also revamped the developmental psychology course that all education majors take before they start their phase requirements, which now focuses on the link between psychological principles and education and incorporates smaller group discussions.

AY 2017

The EPP's assessment system is a comprehensive assessment system which consists of four parts or decision points. These include (1) Admission to Teacher Education (Phase I), (2) Admission to Student Teaching (Phase II), (3) Completion of Student Teaching and (4) Program Completion. The Psychology Education program implements this same comprehensive assessment system, as does all other secondary initial licensure programs. Prior to being admitted into the teacher education program, candidate performance is assessed in the ED/EL220 Introduction to Teaching field experience, competency testing, final grades in selected general education core courses (2.75 GPA with a C or better in MA 110, EG 101, EG 102 SP101), final grades in PY 211 and ED/EL 220 (must be C or better), grades in courses in the teaching field(s), criminal background check, validation of 100 hours working with children, and an acceptable rating on the dispositions assessment. A candidate must also have completed at least 60 hours of college credit with an overall GPA of at least 2.50, demonstrated English language writing and speaking proficiency and completed an application.

From section V of the KSDE report, the following were reported:

To become a high school psychology teacher in Kansas requires master of three standards. Standard 1 is "The teacher of psychology understands the major theoretical approaches, research finding, and historical trends in the science of psychology." The BSE Psychology program assesses content knowledge in five different ways including both standardized and performance assessments.

For Assessment 2 (KPTP Tasks #1 and #2), Assessment 3 (Student Teacher Evaluation), Assessment 5 (the grade for PY401 Foundations of Psychology), and Assessment 6 (PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology) lesson plans, candidates prepare materials in advance and are evaluated on their command of the materials they put together to form a lesson and teach it. While there is an opportunity to study using the ETS Tests at a Glance pamphlet, it is minimal (18 sample test questions for a 100 item exam).

Standard 2 is "The teacher of psychology demonstrates an understanding of the use of major research methods in psychology, including design, data analysis, and interpretation." The first and most striking observation one makes when looking at the icon that represents the interrelationships among the five content domains which constitute the National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula is the centrality of Research Methods to psychological science. It is a real credit to Kansas that an entire standard is devoted to candidate preparation in this area, which is regarded by candidates and BS majors as the most rigorous and difficult part of the curriculum. The BSE Psychology program at Emporia State University takes very seriously that candidates not only possess the knowledge of research methods and statistics but have the skills necessary to do research so they can work with their students in encouraging, demonstrating, and mentoring good research performed ethically.

The program assesses this standard in two ways. First, the program uses the Research Methodology and Statistics subscore of the Praxis II Psychology Content Exam (Assessment 1a). The second assessment is Assessment 7 The PY301 Experimental Research and Inferential Statistics Research Project Manuscript, the finished product of a semester-long dedicated effort on the part of both the student and the professor. It is a tribute to the program that a) all candidates complete two research courses (6 hours of credit), b) that students must earn at least a C in both courses, and c) students must complete a research project at the Acceptable level.

Standard 3 is "The teacher of psychology applies the major theoretical approaches in psychology to reality-based personal, social, motivational, emotional, educational, and organizational issues." The program assesses candidate's ability to apply psychological content three ways: Assessment 3 (Student Teacher Evaluation), Assessment 4 (KPTP Tasks #3 and #4), and Assessment 6 (PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology Lesson Plans). These assessments emphasis application to educational issues more than the other five areas. Much of teaching and learning is psychology and the assessments provide good opportunities to evaluate whether candidates are using psychological principles to inform their lesson preparation. Candidates provide a lesson on application of psychological content knowledge in the PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology with copious examples and including an assignment where candidates have to generate examples of applications in the six areas included in Standard 3.

The results in the data tables show that the completers adequately meet the 70% threshold marks for all of the standard assessments. The use of assessment results to improve candidate and program performance are documented in section V of the 2017 KSDE report.

AY 2016**Learning Outcomes for the undergraduate Psychology major (BS/BA/BSE)**

1. Our students will demonstrate a broad knowledge base in psychology.
2. Our students will demonstrate the skills to be scientific and creative thinkers while exercising sound judgment.
- 3 Our students will demonstrate the skills to be clear writers and articulate presenters.
4. Our students will demonstrate understanding of diverse views and values as well as of ethical standards in the use of human and animal participants.
5. Our students will demonstrate the intrapersonal skills of self-reflection and self-assessment.

The following is a reflection of section V of the KSDE report relating to acknowledgement of success areas and areas for improvement. To become a high school psychology teacher in Kansas requires master of three standards. Standard 1 is "The teacher of psychology understands the major theoretical approaches, research finding, and historical trends in the science of psychology." The BSE Psychology program assesses content knowledge in five different ways including both standardized and performance assessments. Four of the five assessments present evidence clearly indicating that candidates know their content. And they should, having taken 24 hours of upper division psychology coursework in addition to Introduction to Psychology, Developmental Psychology, and Educational Psychology, which are all required for BSE majors.

For Assessment 2 (Teacher Work Sample Factors 1-4), Assessment 3 (Student Teacher Evaluation), Assessment 5 (the grade for PY401 Foundations of Psychology), and Assessment 6 (PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology) lesson plans, the candidates prepared materials in advance and were evaluated on their command of the materials they had put together to form a lesson and teach it. While there is an opportunity to study using the ETS Tests at a Glance pamphlet, it is minimal (18 sample test questions for a 100 item exam). Yet, candidates passed the Praxis II Exam and scored acceptably on all five subscales.

Standard 2 is "The teacher of psychology demonstrates an understanding of the use of major research methods in psychology, including design, data analysis, and interpretation." The first and most striking observation one makes when looking at the icon that represents the interrelationships among the five content domains which constitute the National Standards for High School Psychology Curricula is the centrality of Research Methods to psychological science. It is a real credit to Kansas that an entire standard is devoted to candidate preparation in this area, which is regarded by candidates and BS majors as the most rigorous and difficult part of the curriculum. The BSE Psychology program at Emporia State University takes very seriously that candidates not only possess the knowledge of research methods and statistics but have the skills necessary to do research so they can work with their students in encouraging, demonstrating, and mentoring good research performed ethically.

The program assesses this standard in two ways. First, the program uses the Research Methodology and Statistics sub-score of the Praxis II Psychology Content Exam (Assessment 1a). Program completers in the last three years have overall scored 82.5% on this subscale. The second assessment is Assessment 7 The PY301 Experimental Research and Inferential Statistics Research Project Manuscript, the finished product of a semester-long dedicated effort on the part of both the student and the professor. The last three years of program completers have been eclectic in how they have entered the program and this has influenced how they have completed this assessment. It is a tribute to the program that a) all candidates complete two research courses (6 hours of credit), b) that students must earn at least a C in both courses, and c) students must complete a research project at the Acceptable level. Candidates are well prepared to "turn their students on" to psychological science.

Standard 3 is "The teacher of psychology applies the major theoretical approaches in psychology to reality-based personal, social, motivational, emotional, educational, and organizational issues." The program assesses candidate's ability to apply psychological content three ways: Assessment 3 (Student Teacher Evaluation), Assessment 4 (Teacher Work Sample Factors 1-4), and Assessment 6 (PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology Lesson Plans). These assessments emphasis application to educational issues more than the other five areas. Much of teaching and learning is psychology and the assessments provide good opportunities to evaluate whether candidates are using psychological principles to inform their lesson preparation. The evidence clearly indicates that candidates are adept in this area.

The evidence also clearly indicates that our candidates are not as strong applying psychology to the five other areas, especially Motivational and Organizational Issues. In working with the faculty last spring about these data, most faculty indicate that they do include application of content knowledge in their courses, but that they would only typically include application to content knowledge that would be presented in that course. Since courses on Theories of Motivation and Industrial/Organizational Psychology are not part of the program, students might not have the content knowledge for application. Another perspective was the following: All candidates and majors know the Law of Effect--behavior followed by something pleasant tends to be repeated and behavior followed by something unpleasant tends not to be repeated. This is a foundational element of motivation. Candidates would recognize the law as the basis for smiley faces, checkmarks, and positive regard from the teacher improving student learning but may not see this recognition as applying psychology to motivational issues.

Yet another perspective is that students may not have familiarity with application, may not have practiced applying psychology, or may not recognize when a faculty member is applying content knowledge even though they are exposed to the level's of Bloom's Taxonomy in both psychology and education courses. The program has implemented the following change to the program: presenting a lesson on application of psychological content knowledge in the PY506 Methods for Teaching Psychology with copious examples and including an assignment where candidates have to generate examples of applications in the six areas included in Standard 3.

Attached Files

- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2](#)
- [Assessment 2 & 4 TWS ScoreSheet](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 3 - Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [Psychology 2017 Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables](#)
- [TTC-PY-PSYCHOLOGY BA](#)
- [TTC-PY-PSYCHOLOGY BS](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric](#)
- [Psychology Report](#)
- [Undergraduate Psychology PASL](#)
- [Undergraduate Psychology PASL BSE](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Tables.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 - Scoring Guide-Student Teaching Evaluation.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.doc](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric.docx](#)
- [BSE Psychology Program of Study.pdf](#)
- [ESU Psychology Report 2017.docx](#)

Program Name: School Psychology MS/Ed.S.

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The assessments and reporting for the KSDE is currently under review. It is anticipated that this assessment plan will be integrating into the newest requirements for the CAEP accreditation for advanced programs. In this transition, the faculty continue to assess their program courses. The curriculum map is current, we are basically awaiting the notification from CAEP as to the timing of when the transition is to occur. The upcoming plan for the 2019 academic year will articulate the specifics of the transition and how we plan to implement changes.

AY 2017

As a result of the assessments and required reporting for the KSDE, the following information was presented in section V of the report which is dedicated to the Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance:

The 2014 cohort was the first intact group to be program completers who have experienced all instructional/course changes and the new rubrics. So the 2015 cohort which is reported on as part of this assessment 3-year cycle is only the second group to have fully experienced, throughout their training, all such changes. The rubric for Assessment 3 had been revised to strengthen its alignment with Standard 5, with new elements added such as "The school psychologist has the skills to work with students and families of various cultures, backgrounds, and individual learning characteristics" and "the school psychologist appreciates diversity and demonstrates sensitivity to diverse populations." 5 items total were added. The rubric for assessment 2 was revised to strengthen its alignment to Standard 6, i.e., a new element was added which states "The evaluation helped identify factors in the learning environment which made it less than optimal for the student" and another "The evaluation contributed to improvement of a supportive learning environment for the student." Five items in total were added. The rubrics for assessment 6 (thesis/project) as well as assessment 7 (inservice delivery) had the scale changed to better qualify the scoring parameters and changed from 0-10 to a 1-5 scaling for each element. Finally, on several rubrics the terminology "needs development," which implies non-acceptable performance, was changed to clarify that the rating indicates "acceptable." On one rubric the term "marginal" was used to indicate "acceptable" and so that terminology change was made as well to clarify its intent. In all of the areas of instruction related to these changes, this cohort has done better than the preceding three years of candidates. The field supervisor rubric used to evaluate candidates for both assessment A2 and A7 still had the word "emergent" in two places in error, which was replaced with the intended word "acceptable."

Historically, though all candidates successfully pass their Praxis II content examination prior to program completion, there were some key areas where they were a bit lower than national averages. The first relates to the school psychologist as a mental health provider. While the program had a required mental health prevention/intervention course, it was taught by an instructor with no experience in this content area, and course content was not well aligned to Best Practices literature. All of these cohorts have taken the course since the program director became its instructor: he is very experienced in the program content and redesigned it so as to cover the knowledge and skills expected for standard 7 (provides or contributes to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students). This report shows an improvement in all measures related to this standard relative to cohorts in earlier years. It is now one of the strongest areas in our candidate's Praxis scores. It is just now being seen how the Praxis restructure for exam 5402 is assessing this change, as it emphasizes prevention and intervention separately rather than having a distinctive mental health content area subtest.

Similarly, both the Praxis II examination and field supervisor ratings consistently have highlighted that candidates have not had enough exposure to content related to schools as systems and broad climate issues. One rubric was changed to better measure this aspect of performance. This content is now emphasized in our seminar course as well as the school-based mental health course, and a review of performance in the field (i.e., during internship, by the university supervisor during field visits) relating to this standard is now regularly undertaken to assure this content is covered more effectively.

Data from comprehensive examinations suggests that results for candidates who are other than exemplary in completing that assessment should have a face-to-face review, question by question, of their results. The purpose will be to help them best understand where they may lack content knowledge, and provide them with carefully targeted "Best Practices" readings to help them improve knowledge prior to taking the examination. This has been done for several years now, and results from program completers starting in the cycle one year ahead of that reported in this report were the first that all program completers had this review. These completers do show improved performance on the Praxis relative to past years before this feedback loop was introduced. That is, Praxis scores did go up from previous three years data in comparison to the 2014 and 2015 cohorts, suggesting this may be a key component, i.e., using the comprehensive examination as a "test drive" of difficulties candidates may have with the Praxis. Finally, in spring 2016 a pilot began which is still in progress through fall 2017 which changes procedures for comprehensive exams, allowing some examinees to complete them under different protocols (i.e., "take home" rather than a traditional proctored exam). Results of that restructure results will not show up until the 19-20 program completers.

Program completers have traditionally not had sufficiently strong knowledge about consultation/collaboration. Though a consultation/collaboration course was required, it was instructed by adaptive education faculty in a different department, and not at all aligned to literature reflective of school psychology. Starting five years ago, candidates have been required to take a new school psychological consultation course that has been created and now required within our curriculum, which better targets the knowledge and skills expected of an entry-level school psychologist. 2014 was the first completer cohort that has had that course and combined with these additional three cycles of data we can ascertain its effectiveness in covering that content: Praxis increases suggest the course is improving content knowledge in that regard as we are exactly at national averages in this content area since 2014, and up to a full 10 percentage points above national: We appear to be exemplary in our instruction toward this standard. Changes to the Praxis in exam 5402 and its de-emphasis on consultation skills showing in results from 2016 and 2017 groups appears to have moved those scores back into the average range this past year.

Treatment integrity and goal setting have historically been a weak part of designing effective interventions, but those have been emphasized in the program since that weakness was seen in earlier data: Starting in 2014 and through the current cohort, all program completers have benefitted from those program changes and now those areas are no longer of concern.

In assessment knowledge and skills, candidates historically have most consistently had difficulty with the following:

- 1) Interpretation of data moves from interpretable global indices to specific task performances
- 2) Hypotheses are generated through collaboration with teacher and/or parent based on initial clarification of referral concerns
- 3) Areas assessed within the evaluation allow the examiner to fully address all elements of the referral and there is evidence that examiner's identification of specific areas to assess are guided by current research
- 4) Intervention selection is the result of systematic data-based decision making
- 5) The student's areas of academic difficulty are clearly defined
- 6) The evaluator demonstrates an understanding of schools and other settings as systems.
- 7) Areas assessed within the evaluation allow the examiner to fully address all elements of the referral and there is evidence that examiner's identification of specific areas to assess are guided by current research.

One issue involves assessment planning, i.e., clearly defining areas of difficulty and generating hypotheses that are clearly stated at the beginning of the assessment. Others involve assessment procedures/interpretation, i.e., fully addressing all elements of referral, and interpreting data from global to specific performance. The remaining involve better demonstration that schools are systems and the intervention selection is linked to data rather than being boilerplate. The core faculty, who instruct all assessment courses, has worked to better incorporate instruction in these matters in the PY841, PY714, PY812, and/or PY843 courses. The cohorts represented in this assessment cycle, i.e., since 2015, are doing measurably better in that regard.

AY 2016

The School Psychology MS/Ed.S. program has been involved in collecting data, analyzing findings, and employing strategies to improve student learning. As an outcome of the Kansas Department of Education program reporting process there were some encouraging findings from previous improvement strategies as well as identification of some new directions to take. In sharing a few change highlights from Section V of the KSDE report (the entire report along with supporting data files are in the file library):

The rubric for Assessment 3 had been revised to strengthen its alignment with Standard 5, with new elements added such as "The school psychologist has the skills to work with students and families of various cultures, backgrounds, and individual learning characteristics" and "the school psychologist appreciates diversity and demonstrates sensitivity to diverse populations."

The rubric for assessment 2 was revised to strengthen its alignment to Standard 6, i.e., a new element was added which states "The evaluation helped identify factors in the learning environment which made it less than optimal for the student" and another "The evaluation contributed to improvement of a supportive learning environment for the student."

Historically, though all candidates successfully pass their Praxis II content examination prior to program completion, there were some key areas where they were a bit lower than national averages. The first relates to the school psychologist as a mental health provider. While the program had a required mental health prevention/intervention course, it was taught by an instructor with no experience in this content area, and course content was not well aligned to Best Practices literature. It was then taught by an adjunct who appeared to not have covered all aspects of the syllabus. As of 2009, the program director became instructor for this course, and redesigned it so as to cover the knowledge and skills expected for standard 7 (provides or contributes to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students). This report reflects data from a cohort who have taken that new course, with an improvement in all measures related to this standard now seen relative to the pre-2010 reports. It is now one of the strongest areas in our candidate's Praxis scores. It remains to be seen how the Praxis restructure for exam 5402 will assess this change, as it emphasizes prevention and intervention separately rather than having a distinctive mental health content area subtest.

Data from comprehensive examinations suggests that results for candidates who are other than exemplary in completing that assessment should have a face-to-face review, question by question, of their results. The purpose will be to help them best understand where they may lack content knowledge, and provide them with carefully targeted "Best Practices" readings to help them improve knowledge prior to taking the examination. This has been done as of 2011-12 and results from program completers in 2014 were the first that all program completers had this review so this 2015 cohort reflects this preparation improving performance on the Praxis. Praxis scores did go up from previous three years data in comparison to the 2014 and 2015 cohorts, suggesting this may be a key component, i.e., using the comprehensive

examination as a "test drive" of difficulties candidates may have with the Praxis. Finally, in spring 2016 a pilot was attempted in which procedures for comprehensive exams would allow some examinees to complete them under different protocols (i.e., "take home" rather than a traditional proctored exam). Results of that are being discussed by faculty and it's possible changes to the structure of the comprehensive examination will occur as a result in the 16-17 academic year, the results of which would not show up until the 19-20 program completers.

The majority of field-based candidates do not find themselves in a situation, or are not expected to be part of, crisis intervention work. Beginning in 2009, we have strived to provide all candidates with NASP "PREPaRE" certified crisis prevention/intervention training as part of their mental health coursework. Unfortunately, this training is extraordinarily expensive to provide in Kansas and it can only be sustained in our program if Kansas educators support those workshops (i.e., as it subsidizes the student registrations). Two of the last three workshops were canceled due to lack of registrations, attributed to the poor economy and its cuts to professional development budgets. So as of 2014, the program began incorporating a version of this training into the mental health coursework. These cohorts did not benefit from that training as they completed their mental health coursework prior to these changes occurring.

One issue involves assessment planning, i.e., clearly defining areas of difficulty and generating hypotheses that are clearly stated at the beginning of the assessment. Others involve assessment procedures/interpretation, i.e., fully addressing all elements of referral, and interpreting data from global to specific performance. The remaining involve better demonstration that schools are systems and the intervention selection is linked to data rather than being boilerplate. The core faculty, who instruct all assessment courses, has worked to better incorporate instruction in these matters in the PY841, PY714, PY812, and/or PY843 courses. The 2015 and 2016 cohorts indeed did better in that regard, though not radically superior to the 2014 program completers. However, several in the 2014 cohort were clinical psychologists with extensive report writing experience. So it's still unclear whether there has been improvement in instruction, or whether recent year's cohorts are being compared to an unusual cohort in 2014 who already possessed these skills.

Overall, these changes have been beneficial to improving student learning as related to the school psychology graduate program.

Learning Outcomes for the School Psychology (MS/Ed.S.) graduate program

- **Standard 1:** The school psychologist uses varied models and methods of assessment as part of a systematic process to collect data and other information, translate assessment results into empirically-based decisions about service delivery, and evaluate the outcomes of services.
- **Standard 2:** The school psychologist has knowledge of behavioral, mental health, collaborative, and/or other consultation models and methods and of the application to particular situations. The school psychologist collaborates and consults effectively with others in planning and decision-making processes at the individual, group, and system levels.
- **Standard 3:** The school psychologist, in collaboration with others, develops appropriate cognitive and academic goals for students with different abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs, implements intervention to achieve those goals, and evaluates the effectiveness of intervention.
- **Standard 4:** The school psychologist, in collaboration with others, develops appropriate behavioral, affective, adaptive, and social goals for students of varying abilities, disabilities, strengths, and needs, implements interventions to achieve those goals, and evaluates the effectiveness of intervention.
- **Standard 5:** The school psychologist demonstrates the sensitivity and skills needed to work with individuals of diverse characteristics and to implement strategies selected based on individual characteristics, strengths, and needs.
- **Standard 6:** The school psychologist has knowledge of general education, special education, and other educational and related services and understands schools and other settings as systems. The school psychologist works with individuals and groups to facilitate policies and practices that create and maintain safe, supportive, and effective learning environments for children and others.
- **Standard 7:** The school psychologist provides or contributes to prevention and intervention programs that promote the mental health and physical well-being of students.
- **Standard 8:** The school psychologist works effectively with families, educators, and others in the community to promote and provide comprehensive services to children and families.
- **Standard 9:** The school psychologist evaluates research, translates research into practice, and understands research design and statistics in sufficient depth to plan and conduct investigations and program evaluations for improvement of services.
- **Standard 10:** The school psychologist has knowledge of the history and foundations of the profession, of various service models and methods, of public policy development applicable to services to infants, children and families, and of ethical, professional, and legal standards. The school psychologist practices in ways that are consistent with applicable standards, is involved in the profession, and has the knowledge and skills needed to acquire career-long professional development.
- **Standard 11:** The school psychologist accesses, evaluates, and utilizes information sources and technology in ways that safeguard or enhance the quality of services.
- **Standard 12:** The school psychologist must complete an internship supervised by the recommending institution as part of the performance assessment for this license.

Attached Files

- [TTC-PY-SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY-MS-EDS](#)
- [A3DataSupervision 2014 to 2017](#)
- [A4DataIntervention 2014 to 2017](#)
- [A5CompExamsData 2014 to 2017](#)
- [A6DataThesis 2014 to 2017](#)
- [A7DataInservice 2014 to 2017](#)
- [A7DatainterventionInterns 2014 to 2017](#)
- [A7DataSupervisionInterns 2014 to 2017](#)
- [KSDE Report 2017](#)
- [Plan of Study](#)
- [A1DataPraxis 2014 to 2017](#)
- [A2DataAssessStudies 2014 to 2017](#)
- [School Psychology KSDE Report 2014](#)
- [School Psychology PASL](#)
- [A5 Comp Exams Data2016 Completers three year trends](#)
- [A5 Rubric Comps 2016](#)
- [A6 Data Thesis 2016 ThreeYear](#)
- [A6 Rubric Thesis 2016](#)
- [A7 Data Assess Studies 2016](#)
- [A7 Data Supervision 2016 three year trend](#)
- [A7 DataInservice Pro Dev 2016](#)
- [A7 Rubric Assess Case Studies Interns 2016](#)
- [A7 Rubric Inservice Interns 2016](#)
- [A7 Rubric Supervision Interns 2016](#)
- [1 School Psychologist Report 2016](#)
- [A1Data PraxisII 2016 three year trend](#)
- [A2 Data Assess Studies 2016](#)
- [A2 Rubric Assessment Cases 2016](#)
- [A3 Data Supervision 2016 three year trend](#)
- [A3 Rubric Supervision 2016](#)
- [A4 Data Intervention 2016 three year trend](#)
- [A4 Rubric Intervention 2016](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:**Academic Year 2018**

The Psychology department has faced some assessment challenges over this past year, despite this, the faculty have done a nice job in participating in assessment activities. There were 21 course level assessment reports submitted by faculty and graduate teaching assistants. The courses were PY301, PY401, PY210, PY211, PY827, PY846, and PY848. In addition, there was great participation by the GTA's in reporting their assessments for the PY100 courses. As with any new process, it is a challenge to communicate the intended roles and responsibilities. Dr. Grover has done a nice job with the assessment of the PY100 course and in making contributions to the assessment of the General Education program goals. This year was the third in the cycle for reporting the assessment of Critical Thinking Skills using the AAC&U value rubric for evaluating Critical Thinking.

The KSDE reporting cycle for the Psychology BSE was completed this past October with the submission of the report for review. In addition, these assessment efforts were a key part of the CAEP specialized accreditation for the Education Preparation Programs. The section V of this report was copied and pasted into the report area for the BSE program. This overview of how assessment data inform change strategies to improve the program is concise and provides evidence of intentional changes.

The transition to the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Plans shows that planning for the courses to be assessed in years 2-4, along with the identification of the capstone courses and experiences have been identified. Dr. Wade submitted course level reports for the Clinical Psychology program, however he was the only faculty member submitting their course embedded assessments for the Master programs. The data identified in the 5-year plans was retrieved from the Student Success Metrics file and from the Banner database. The success metrics show that students are successfully completing the capstone experiences and related courses identified in year 2 for assessment. It may be beneficial for us to review how to best communicate expectations when it comes to the report completion in the campus labs planning

module. There were quite a few areas where the data was available, but the interface text had yet to be entered. It's all just a work in progress, and based on quite a few obstacles facing the department this past year, we shall get through this too. I'm always willing to share my assessment expertise, hold assessment workshops, and meet with your faculty to assist in any way I can. I look forward to working with the department faculty this upcoming year. Thanks for all you do!

Academic Year 2017

The Psychology department faculty have done a nice job of leveraging their assessment efforts. The faculty have been engaged in the assessment and reporting of multiple programs concurrently in preparation for the reaccreditation of the Clinical Psychology MS, Psychology BSE, and School Psychology MS/Eds programs, respectively. In addition, efforts have been placed on assessing the general education course (PY100) and reported as a part of the annual course-embedded assessment reporting. The assessment data and report for critical thinking was also completed this past year (PY100, Dr. Grover and Dr. Persinger) as a part of a 3-year multiple-discipline project to measure student learning of critical thinking skills using the AAC&U value rubric as the instrument to evaluate student assignments. These assessment efforts are greatly appreciated! Going forward, the department has placed emphasis on the planning and implementation of the 5-Year Program Level Assessment Cycle plans and this should position the specific programs to implement some additional course-embedded assessments over the cycle. This data should serve the department well at the course and program levels. Working to continuously improve the student learning, meanwhile refreshing the curriculum at least once every five years should provide beneficial. The most pressing challenge I see facing the department is in operationalizing the 5-Year plan for the I/O Psychology MS program. There has been a lapse in assessment activities in this degree program (this assumption is based on the sharing of assessment data and reports). If the department can get the assessment practices for the I/O program up to speed with other program assessment practices, the department will be in good shape. Sometimes these changes take time, I am available to help out in this process in any way that I can. I sincerely appreciate all of the assessment work that has been completed with very high levels of integrity and expertise over this past year, Kudos to those who committed their efforts and expertise! Nice Job!

Academic Year 2016

Over the past academic year, the department has experienced some big challenges. The assessment work completed for the School Counseling MS program is exceptional. The improvement efforts implemented since the last KSDE review and report have shown to be highly effective and also to identify additional areas to focus change efforts. The changes included adding courses, revising curriculum, and adapting assessment strategies including rubric redesign and alignment. The assessment of the PY100 Introductory Psychology course provided contributions to the assessment of the general education program and evidenced the role that the Psychology department has in impacting students' general education learning experiences. The senior survey was completed by 24 graduating Psychology majors and the results are attached in the file library. Reviewing the results may be beneficial to the undergraduate faculty.

For the upcoming year, it will be important to address the voids that are currently showing in the assessment template for the Psychology department. The curriculum map for the I/O Psychology program will need to be completed and uploaded into the SKYBOX repository. I will copy it to this template in the curriculum map folder. The assessment data for a few of the programs dates back to 2013. Please upload evidence files showing assessment results for 2014 - 2016 assessments in the appropriate program areas. Also, there should be some annual assessment plans being followed for each of the programs in your department with the affiliated reporting on an annual basis. This past year was spent updating the curriculum maps and ensuring that student learning outcomes are included in all syllabi. This is a good place to move forward with new assessment plans being driven by the findings from the curriculum mapping exercises. For the upcoming year, enhanced assessment efforts are encouraged and that each program provide narrative and evidence documents to show that assessment is a common and continuous practice in the department. I am available to assist in these planning and implementation efforts if need be.

Academic Year 2015

The assessment plan for the Psychology department has a strong presence in those degree programs which prepare educators and are aligned with Kansas Department of Education standards and this holds true for both undergraduate and graduate programs. The continuous assessments and program check points insure that students are progressing accordingly at each level of the educational process. The undergraduate programs (BS and BA) share curriculum with the BSE degree and the courses that make up this shared curriculum are assessed as one. Likewise those courses that are shared across the various Psychology graduate programs can be assessed together as well. Measuring the formative student learning in these core courses may provide a large enough sample to make the findings generalizable. The Experimental Psychology program based most of its assessments of student success on the process of conducting research and appropriately so, as this is what the degree program is about. However it appears that the assessment time line is lengthy beginning with the thesis proposal and including all of the other components of the thesis research project combined. It may be beneficial to assess individual steps in the research process and have change strategies for each step. Also, the small sample sizes could make the findings unfit for making change decisions. It was hard to determine if any conclusions from this assessment could be used to improve the student learning experience. The program learning outcomes for Experimental Psychology present an opportunity for refinement. The outcomes should be current and include some editing by removing the "Our" and using a similar structure as presented in the learning outcomes from I/O Psychology and

School Psychology. This would also apply to the learning outcomes for the undergraduate Psychology major. A suggested area for emphasis in the upcoming year, would be focusing on the Experimental Psychology program which appears would benefit from assessment efforts. The I/O Psychology 2013 Program Report was a highly effective presentation of assessment efforts, findings, evaluation, and identification of areas for betterment. There is note of a few changes being contemplated, be sure to include how these change strategies were implemented including the resulting affects on improving student learning. Close the loop. Great job on pulling this together, keep up the good work, and keep your program level student learning outcomes at the forefront of the conversations with faculty.

Providing Department: Psychology

Responsible Roles:

Jim Persinger (E10088236), George Yancey (E10262552), Cathy Grover (E10000005), John Wade (E10341695), Joan Brewer (E10000569)

5-YEAR PROGRAM LEVEL ASSESSMENT CYCLE PLANS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Clinical Psychology MS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

PY858 and PY859 are capstone experiences and will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the Clinical Psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, professional competencies and dispositions important to the clinical psychology candidate. The assigned grades for these courses are either P, No Pass, or In-Progress.

Summary 2018

During the 2018 academic year, there were a total of 39 students enrolled in PY859-Clinical Internship and 17 students in PY858-Interdisciplinary Referral and Collaboration. Overall, students were successful in fulfilling the requirements for these capstone courses.

Course	Pass	In-Progress	No Pass
PY-858 - Interdisciplinary	17 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
PY-859 - Clinical Internship	33 (85%)	6 (15%)	0 (0%)

Attached Files

[TTC-CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY-MS](#)

[Intern Evaluation Clinical Psychology MS program](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

We will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the Clinical Psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, professional competencies and dispositions important to the clinical psychology candidate.

Summary Year 2 - Academic Year 2018

ER 857-Statistical Methods for Education and Psychology II

From 2016 through 2018, 24 students completed ER857, with 21 (88%) students exceeding expectations, 2 (8%) meeting expectations, and 1 (4%) not meeting expectations. Student achievement is measured through participation, computer assignments, examinations, and a group project with presentation.

PY 827-Seminar in Psychopathology

In the past three years, 48 students completed the seminar - the instruments used for measuring performance were treatment report papers and examinations. All students successfully completed the course. There are no planned changes at this time.

PY 846-Culture/Assessment in Psychology

Trend data shows that 44 students completed this course with 43 (98%) exceeding expectations and one student (2%) not meeting

expectations. There were 3 examinations, a book report presentation, and a cultural event reaction paper used to measure student learning. There are no planned changes at this time.

PY 848-Family and Group Psychotherapy

There were 42 students completing the course and all met or exceeded expectations. The instruments used to measure student learning were three examinations and a research paper. There are no planned changes at this time.

Attached Files

[Wade-John-PY827-SP18.pdf](#)

[Wade-John-PY846-SP18.pdf](#)

[Wade-John-PY848-SP18.pdf](#)

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

We will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the Clinical Psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, professional competencies and dispositions important to the clinical psychology candidate.

PY 847

PY 849

PY 703

PY 841

Summary Year 3

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

We will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the Clinical Psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, professional competencies and dispositions important to the clinical psychology candidate.

PY 806

PY 807

ER 851

Summary Year 4

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Clinical Psychology MS

Responsible Roles: Jim Persinger (E10088236)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Industrial Psychology MS

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

The PY839 Internship and PY800 Thesis courses make up the capstone component of the course. Students will be scored to the curriculum map for the program. We have a rubric scoring mechanism in place where students are evaluated based on their abilities on the program level learning objectives.

Summary Academic Year 2018

PY839 - Internship

The three-year trend data (2016-2018) shows that 14 students have successfully completed the internship course.

PY800 - Thesis

Students enroll in the PY800 course over a series of terms until their research has been completed. In the past three years, 34 students pursued their thesis work and 14 (41%) completed the requirements. Currently, there are 20 (59%) students in the process of completing their research.

Attached Files

[TTC-PY-I-O PSYCHOLOGY-MS](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

Summary Year 2 - Academic Year 2019

PY743 - Dr. Yancey - Fall18

PY832 - Dr. Yancey - Fall18

PY833 - Dr. Yancey - Spring19

PY745 - Dr. Schrader - Spring19

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

ER851 - Dr. Luo - Fall19

ER857 - Dr. Luo - Spring20

PY742 - Dr. Yancey - Fall19

PY744 - Dr. Schrader - Spring20

Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

PY740 - Dr. Yancey - Fall20

PY741 - Dr. Schrader - Spring21

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Industrial Psychology MS

Responsible Roles: Jim Persinger (E10088236)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Psychology BS/BA

Start: 07/01/2016

End: 06/30/2022

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Years 1 - 4: Annual Assessments and Reporting:

PY401 and PY490 are capstone experiences and will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the BA/BS psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, introspection, and behaviors important to the psychology major.

Summary 2018

In academic year 2018, there were a total of 56 students who completed the **PY401- Foundations of Psychology** and **PY490 - Undergraduate Internship** courses, with 47 (84%) exceeding expectations and 9 (16%) meeting expectations. There weren't any students who didn't meet expectations. The three-year trend data for student success in these two courses shows that 80% (n=151) exceeded expectations, 15% (n=28) met expectations, and 5% (n=10) did not meet expectations.

3-Year Trend Data (Grades)	Exceeded Expectations	Met Expectations	Did Not Meet Expectations
PY401-Foundations	54 (60%)	26 (29%)	10 (11%)
PY490-Internship	97 (98%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)

Attached Files

- [TTC-PY-PSYCHOLOGY BA](#)
- [TTC-PY-PSYCHOLOGY BS](#)
- [Arnold-Jackie-PY211-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Arnold-Jackie-PY211-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Belyea-Rodger-PY100-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Bradetich-Aaron-PY100-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Cyr-Kaitlin-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Grover-Cathy-PY301-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Grover-Cathy-PY401-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Koehn-Clarie-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Carlson-Dani-PY100-FY17.pdf](#)
- [Klema-Alexandria-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Koehn-Clarie-PY100-AY18.pdf](#)
- [McEnerney-Kelly-PY211-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Miller-Breyana-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [O'Brien-Megan-PY210-SP18.pdf](#)
- [O'Brien-Megan-PY211-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Swisher-Morgan-PY100-FA17.pdf](#)
- [Wray-Anna-PY100-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Swisher-Morgan-PY101-FA17.pdf](#)

Year 2: Course Group Assessments and Reporting:

PY300 and **PY301** will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the BA/BS psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, ethics understanding, and behaviors important to the psychology major.

Summary 2018**Student Learning Outcomes Results**

The student learning outcomes for the PY300 and PY301 courses were comprehensively positive, both the most current 2017 year and the three-year trend data show that students are successfully completing these key major required courses.

PY301

In the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters, 44 students completed the PY301 Course where 34 (77.3%) exceeded expectations, 8 (18.2%) met expectations, and 2 (4.5%) did not meet expectations. Over the past three academic years, 131 students completed the course where 94 (71.8%) exceeded expectations, 28 (21.4%) met expectations, and 9 (6.9%) did not meet expectations.

PY300

In the fall 2017 and spring 2018 semesters, 64 students completed the PY300 Course where 50 (78.1%) exceeded expectations, 12 (18.8%) met expectations, and 2 (3.1%) did not meet expectations. Over the past three academic years, 188 students completed the course where 134 (71.3%) exceeded expectations, 37 (19.7%) met expectations, and 17 (9.0%) did not meet expectations.

Year 3: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:

PY102, **PY322** and **PY333** will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the BA/BS psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, ethics understanding, and behaviors important to the psychology major.

Summary Year Three**Year 4: Course Group Assessment and Reporting:**

PY427 and **PY440** will use student work samples identified by course faculty to score the BA/BS psychology learning objectives identified in the curriculum map. These courses include student work and recognize content knowledge, skills, and behaviors important to the psychology major.

Summary Year 4

Year 5: Executive Summary Assessment Reporting:

Providing Department: Psychology BS/BA

Responsible Roles: Jim Persinger (E10088236)

UNIT REPORT

**School Leadership & Middle and Secondary Teacher Education
Assessment Report 2018**

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:47 AM

**School Leadership - Middle and Secondary Teacher Education Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

The assessment plan for undergraduate programs will continue to focus on the STEP program, which is a redesign of the Secondary Teacher Education Program. The implementation of the STEP (Secondary Teacher Expanded Practice) program continues at Emporia High School and Emporia Middle School. The program offers increased Phase I student-contact time for pre-service teacher candidates, providing them with hands-on interaction and planning and implementing lesson plans for small group, one-on-one, and large group activities in the Emporia public schools. The new student teacher observation instrument is in use. The new observation instrument is closely aligned with the KSDE Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP) document used to evaluate teachers in many districts across Kansas. The graduate programs faculty are focused on transitioning to an accelerated format for delivery of our online educational administration and curriculum and instruction programs. The new roll-out of the 7-week course format will begin around July 1, 2018. Many course adjustments will be needed, along with acquiring qualified faculty to teach what we expect will be numerous additional students in the programs. Graduate faculty continue to prepare students for Praxis Licensure exams in an effort to maintain our stellar record of nearly 100% of our graduates passing the Building and District Level Praxis Licensure Exams over the past several years.

AY 2017

The assessment plan for undergraduate programs will continue to focus on a redesign of the Secondary Teacher Education Program of studies. This redesign includes the implementation of the STEP (Secondary Teacher Expanded Practice) program at Emporia High School and Emporia Middle School. The program offers increased Phase I student-contact time for pre-service teacher candidates, providing them with hands-on interaction and planning and implementing lesson plans for small group, one-on-one, and large group activities in the Emporia public schools. The STEP program is somewhat in a similar format to the PDS (Professional Development School) partnership to enhance the preparation of secondary teachers for success in the classroom. STEP students are evaluated using a pre- and post-test micro-teach rubric aligned with the INTASC standards. In addition, a new student teacher observation instrument is in the pilot stage. The new observation instrument is closely aligned with the KSDE Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol (KEEP) document used to evaluate teachers in many districts across Kansas. The graduate programs faculty have made updates to existing Educational Administration (Building) comprehensive exams to better align the exams with the current KSDE assessment standards. In addition, the practicum research project outcomes have been aligned with similar standards. Graduate faculty continue to prepare students for Praxis Licensure exams in an effort to maintain our stellar record of nearly 100% of our graduates passing the Building and District Level Praxis Licensure Exams over the past several years.

AY2016

The assessment plan for the undergraduate programs is decentralized as secondary education bachelor of science in education programs are a part of the program level assessments for each respective departmental major. These programs are very similar for bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, and bachelor of science in education programs. The differences in the curriculums are typically a couple of courses. The bachelor of science in education major programs are structured and assessed as required by the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE).

These KSDE reports reside in each of the respective program assessment areas for Art, Biology, Business, Chemistry, Earth and Space Science, English, ESOL, Foreign Language-Spanish, Health, History and Government, Journalism, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Physics, Psychology, and Speech/Theater. Licensure testing for Principles of Learning and Teaching and content area exams are reported to KSDE as the percentage of graduates who successfully complete licensure exam requirements. There are six undergraduate courses which make up the instructional curriculum for the department and these courses are assessed accordingly (see attached course listings evidence document). The graduate programs are designed to prepare personnel to assume leadership roles as lead teachers, building-leadership team members, coordinators, supervisors, principals, superintendents, and other central office personnel. The curricula for the graduate programs are delivered almost entirely by department faculty. The assessments for the graduate programs are aligned with KSDE licensure requirements to prepare students with the content knowledge and skills to successfully complete licensure. This includes the assessment of MS in Education Administration District-level Leadership and Building-level Leadership; MS in Curriculum and Instruction with concentrations in Curriculum Leadership, Effective Practitioner, and National Board Certification; and Master of Education in Teaching via

two options, Alternate Route/Restricted Licensure program or Masters Program for those students already licensed to teach.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

Assessment of both undergraduate and graduate programs is ongoing. The Teachers College continues in the process of navigating the transition from NCATE to CAEP. In addition, the Kansas Department of Education reports have been submitted and some rewrites are in progress as we update course-specific and comprehensive exam rubrics. There were multiple strategies employed as a result of the assessment practices across the major programs. Revisions to the Ed Admin and C&I Practicums were made to include specific elements related to special education and diversity. The reports and data files are contained in the file libraries for the specific programs.

AY 2017

There were multiple strategies employed as a result of the assessment practices across the major programs. Some of these strategies include creating and implementing new summative assessment instruments more specifically designed to measure candidate's achievement of program learning outcomes with an increased emphasis on aspects of technology, research data, and education of diverse populations within the framework of curriculum development (theory and practice), revisions in Practicum were made to include specific elements related to special education and diversity, a comprehensive exam was implemented for non-degree candidates as well as master level candidates, courses were reviewed to ensure that state standards and Praxis content are addressed and assessed within specific content areas, and throughout the 2014-2017 time frame, practicum (field experience) activities were realigned and revised to add specific field experience in diversity, specific district demographics, and a greater range of experiences within the area of special education. The reports and data files are contained in the file libraries for the specific programs.

AY 2016

The curriculum mapping exercises were effective in helping the department to identify some possible areas to improve student learning and to narrow assessment priorities for the upcoming year. These findings along with the revision of the standards for licensure programs by the KSDE will both serve to inform assessment efforts for the 2017 academic year. Our basic assessment plan has not changed from 2015.

AY 2015

Assessment of both undergraduate and graduate programs is ongoing. ESU is in the process of navigating the transition from NCATE to CAEP. In addition, the Kansas Department of Education is in the process of updating program standards at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is anticipated that these changes are being implemented into the KSDE assessments and will become a part of the overall assessment programs for this upcoming fall 2015. Besides the changes that are in progress, there will be some additional changes related to these CAEP and KSDE transitions. Reports for next year will be reflective of what transpires.

Attached Files

- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2014](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2015](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2016](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2017](#)
- [Senior Survey Results - School Leadership-Middle-Secondary Teacher Education - AY2018.pdf](#)
- [Program Review Indicators - SCHOOL LEADERSHIP 2018](#)
- [Luo-Neal-ER752-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Stiffler-Dan-ED833-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Will-Jerry-EA773-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Will-Jerry-EA888-SP18.pdf](#)
- [Will-Jerry-EA998-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name: Curriculum/Instruction - MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

Program assessments continue to be the C&I Master's Degree Comprehensive Assessment, the Written Assessment (Journal) of Leadership in Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction, the Mentor/Supervisor Assessment (Checklist) of Leadership in Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction, and the Completion of Coursework in ED820 Curriculum Leadership: Models and Strategies.

These program assessments are, and have been, approved within the unit assessment system. The assessment practices for the MS in C&I follow the KSDE reporting guidelines. Based on the continuing analysis of the data, faculty continues to believe that candidate performance on this assessment has strengthened candidate accountability. This supports the theoretical framework of the college regarding application of interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, effective practice, response to uncertainty and change, and self-reflection.

The graduate programs faculty will be focused on transitioning to an accelerated format (Academic Partnerships) for delivery of our online educational administration and curriculum and instruction programs. The new roll-out of the 7-week course format will begin around July 1, 2018. Many course adjustments will be needed, along with acquiring qualified faculty to teach what we expect will be numerous additional students in the programs.

Files supporting assessment efforts are included in the file library.

AY 2017

The Curriculum and Instruction Masters Program at Emporia State University is designed to reflect every aspect of the Teachers College Conceptual Framework. The Teachers College Conceptual Framework reflects the philosophy that for educators to help all students learn, they must have a command of content, critical ideas and skills, and the capacity to reflect on, evaluate, and learn from their practice so that it continually improves.

The candidates preparing to be curricular leaders are immersed in specific academic courses that faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of educators seeking a career in leadership roles. These courses value a number of tenets deemed essential to preparing candidates as leaders within their profession and include 1) the value of cultural awareness and diversity, 2) the development and relevance of authentic assessment, 3) the essentials of professional development, 4) the importance of mentoring and collaboration, 5) the significance of access to information, 6) importance and application of research, 7) the value of leadership and effective practices, and 8) the significance of information and utilization of effective technology.

Program assessments include the C&I Master's Degree Comprehensive Assessment, the Written Assessment (Journal) of Leadership in Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction, the Mentor/Supervisor Assessment (Checklist) of Leadership in Planning and Implementing Curriculum and Instruction, and the Completion of Coursework in ED820 Curriculum Leadership: Models and Strategies. These program assessments are, and have been, approved within the unit assessment system. The assessment practices for the Curriculum and Instruction MS follow the KSDE reporting guidelines and reports and data files are submitted on an annual basis.

Recently, an analysis of the Comprehensive Exam was used to create and implement a new summative assessment (Analysis and Achievement of Learning Outcomes) which was designed to more specifically measure candidate's achievement of program learning outcomes. Based on the continuing analysis of the data, faculty continues to believe that candidate performance on this assessment has strengthened candidate accountability. In particular, this assessment added emphasis on aspects of technology, research data, and education of diverse populations within the framework of curriculum development (theory and practice). This supports the theoretical framework of the college regarding application of interdisciplinary scholarly knowledge, effective practice, response to uncertainty and change, and self-reflection.

Files supporting assessment efforts are included in the file library.

Attached Files

- [TTC-SL-CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION-MS](#)
- [C&I Annual Report](#)
- [C&I Annual Report](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data table Part 1](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table Part 3](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data table Part 2](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data table Part 2 Spring 2014](#)
- [Assessment 1 Appendix 1 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 1 Comprehensive Exam Part 1 C & I](#)
- [C I Program totals](#)
- [Composite Table](#)

Program Name: Education Administration - Building Level MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The graduate programs faculty will be focused on transitioning to an accelerated format for delivery of our online educational administration and curriculum and instruction programs. The new roll-out of the 7-week course format will begin around July 1, 2018. Many course adjustments will be needed, along with acquiring qualified faculty to teach what we expect will be numerous additional students in the programs. Based on the KSDE Report submitted in October 2017, Section V presents the strategies used to improve candidate and program performance and is shown as written in the report.

Utilizing the data collected and analyzed, plus the Praxis results to date, focus review summaries, and program exit surveys; the following changes have been made to the Building Level Leadership program. Note: Focus review groups are held every two years and exit survey data is collected and reviewed at the same time. Monthly faculty meetings are also used to review and discuss program data and requirements.

Revisions in Practicum are ongoing. The faculty works together to review candidate performance at least once each semester, compiling suggestions for improvement and spending time during the same making changes. Candidates are now given a possible timeline for completing work and are monitored closely by faculty members. Changes have been made to include specific elements related to special education and diversity. These changes were made to better prepare candidates to successfully complete scenarios presented on the Praxis exam. Feedback from candidates indicated a need for this change.

The Comprehensive Exam has been implemented for non-degree candidates as well as master level candidates. This assessment was added to assess whether candidates completing the Building Level program leave with the skills necessary to work with candidate and staff in the current century. In addition, a major re-write of the second half of the comprehensive exam was done to help candidates better understand performance expectations. Although only one "total" score is recorded for each candidate, the score provides better clarity of a candidate's ability to understand complex processes and use data.

A voluntary anonymous survey has been added to the Comprehensive Exam that has yielded high participation rates and consistent data to use for program improvement.

Courses were reviewed to ensure that state standards and Praxis content are addressed and assessed within specific content areas. Feedback during Focus reviews, dialogue with candidates during the practicum experience, and exit surveys in the comprehensive exam keep the emphasis on current skills necessary for success in the field. In particular, faculty has addressed the biggest desire for improvement expressed by candidates – more opportunities to collaborate. All of the program coursework contains more and better discussion opportunities through Canvas and the amount of group work in courses has increased.

Realigned and revised Practicum activities to address online Practicum needs and concerns as expressed in the November 2016 Focus Review.

Revised EA896 and EA897 to specifically address non-English speaking programs within the area of diversity. Feedback from candidates who took the revised Praxis exam expressed a need for more exposure in this area to better equip future candidates in the completion of scenarios presented in the exam.

Data are continually analyzed by the faculty to insure that program completers have the knowledge, skills, and collaborative connections to meet any challenge they face.

AY 2017

The candidates preparing for building leadership (principal, assistant principal, or other building level leader as indicated by KSDE), are immersed in specific academic courses that faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of educators seeking a career in leadership roles. These courses value a number of tenets deemed essential to preparing candidates as leaders within their profession and include 1) the value of cultural awareness and diversity, 2) the development and relevance of authentic assessment, 3) the essentials of professional development, 4) the importance of mentoring and collaboration, 5) the significance of access to information, 6) the importance and application of research, 7) the value of leadership and effective practices, and 8) the significance of information and utilization of effective technology.

Utilizing the data collected and analyzed, plus the state Praxis results to date, focus review summaries, and program exit surveys; the following changes have been made to the Building Level Leadership program. Note: Focus review groups are held every two years and exit survey data is collected and reviewed at the same time. Monthly faculty meetings are also used to review and discuss program data and requirements. 1) Revisions in Practicum were made to include specific elements related to special education and diversity. These changes were made to better prepare candidates to successfully complete scenarios presented on the Praxis exam. Feedback from candidates indicated a need for this change. 2) Comprehensive Exam has been implemented for non-degree candidates as well as master level candidates. This

assessment was added to assess whether candidates completing the building level program leave with the skills necessary to work with student and staff in the current century. 3) Courses were reviewed to ensure that state standards and Praxis content are addressed and assessed within specific content areas. Feedback during Focus reviews, dialogue with students during the practicum experience, and exit surveys keeps the emphasis on current skills necessary for success in the field.

Attached Files

- [TTC-SL-ED ADMINISTRATION BUILDING-MS](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Table - Praxis](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Ethical Leadership Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 5 Comp Exam Data Table](#)
- [Assessment 5 Comp Exam Scoring Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 & 7 Practicum Leadership Project Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table](#)
- [Building Leadership KSDE Report 2016-17 09-09-17](#)
- [Building Leadership Practicum Project](#)
- [EA 896 GÇô EA 897 Activity Rubric](#)
- [Practicum Project Data Table](#)
- [Practicum Project Proposal Rubric](#)
- [Assessment 4 Data Table EA888 for 2014 Fall EA District](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data Table - Praxis.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Data Table - Practicum Activities.docx](#)
- [Assessment 3 Rubric - Practicum Activities.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Ethical Leadership Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 5 Comp Exam Data Table.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Data Table - Practicum Activities.docx](#)
- [Assessment 7 Rubric - Practicum Activities.docx](#)
- [Assessment 5 Comp Exam Scoring Rubric.doc](#)
- [Assessment 6 Rubric - Practicum Project.docx](#)
- [Assessment 6 Data Table - Practicum Project.docx](#)
- [EA Build degree plan.doc](#)
- [EA Build licensure plan.doc](#)
- [ESU Building Leadership KSDE Report 2016-17.docx](#)

Program Name: Education Administration District Licensure

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

The graduate programs faculty are focused on transitioning to an accelerated format for delivery of our online educational administration and curriculum and instruction programs. The new roll-out of the 7-week course format will begin around July 1, 2018. Many course adjustments will be needed, along with acquiring qualified faculty to teach what we expect will be numerous additional students in the programs. Based on the KSDE Report submitted in October 2017, Section V presents the strategies used to improve candidate and program performance and is shown as written in the report.

Utilizing the data collected and analyzed, plus the state Praxis results to date, focus review summaries, and program exit surveys the following changes have been made to the District Level Leadership program. Note: Monthly faculty meetings and EA District Level Focus Review Groups were utilized in the discussion and review of the district level program. These meetings were also used to review and discuss program data and requirements. From those discussions and meetings, the following changes or revisions were made within the EA District Level Program:

March 2017: The program requirement of having a mandatory 60 hours of graduate credit to apply for licensure was deleted as the state had dropped this requirement during previous years.

February 2017: Changed district course sequence requirement where all four courses had to be taken before the practicum to requiring two or more of the courses be taken prior to the the practicum, i.e., candidates must complete at least two courses prior to the practicum (could be more) and candidates would then be required to complete the remaining one or two courses the summer after the practicum. NOTE: A significant increase in enrollment was seen after this change went into affect.

November 2017: From the EA Focus review the following changes were made or topics stressed within the district program.

1. a) add curriculum and an activity dealing with administrators as change agents,
2. b) add a discussion activity relating to interpreting and applying research findings,
3. c) continue and maintain collaborative activities and discussion, and
4. d) stress the need for administrators to work on skills needed in multi-ethnic settings as well as when working with 'at risk' students.

2015: Due to a KSDE requirement change, EA District Level candidates were now required to have 5 years of teaching experience prior to licensure application.

August 2015: The KSDE newly revised District Level Standards were discussed and applied within syllabi, program objectives, and then applied to this report.

2014-2015: The following changes were discussed and made during several staff meetings when addressing diversity within the program: EA District Level courses and practicum changes include but are not limited to: a) activity involving KSDE Annual Reports and due dates, b) required district level central office candidates to attend one state level conference, c) require district level special education candidates to attend one state or tri-state special education conference, d) encourage candidates to become members of administrator and special education professional organizations, e) provide information on negotiating teacher and administrator contracts as well as become knowledgeable of the negotiaion process, and f) provide more group discussion and individual projects within the courses and practicum. In addition, the discussion of 'diversity' was identified as being taught within EA885, EA888, EA997/998 District Practicums, and ER752.

2015: Additional clarifications and revisions were made relating to the practicum activities as well as including specific elements relating to special education and diversity. These changes were a result of candidate feedback in relation to more exposure to diverse settings and to better equip candidates for related questions/scenarios on the state praxis exam. Candidate feedback was aslso gained from candidate exit survey, focus review comments, and those candidates enrolled in specific program courses. Assessment data evidence demonstrates a positive learning curve as related to the changes and content revisions.

2014-2015: Courses were reviewed to ensure that the new and revised state standards and Praxis content data are addressed and assessed within specific content areas. Assessments #1, #2, #4, and #5 were used to shape curriculum content within the program. In addition, biannual focus review assessment feedback, exit survey data, and comments from those completing the state assessment were used in and during each review. Note: This is an ongoing review process and done during monthly meetings or special program review work sessions. Department faculty minutes show that various revisions have been made to the program admission requirements, comprehensive exam instrument, course content, and data collection.

February 2014: From the EA Focus review practicum (field experience) activities were realigned and revised to add specific field experience in diversity, specific district demographics, and a greater range of experiences within the area of special education. Data evidence was used from Assessments #3, #4, #6, & #7 along with evidence gained from previous candidate feedback on exit surveys and the biannual focus review.

AY 2017

The candidates preparing to be a leader at the district level within the administrative profession are immersed in specific academic courses that faculty believe to be essential for the professional development and growth of educators seeking a career in leadership roles. These courses value a number of tenets deemed essential to preparing candidates as leaders within their profession and include 1) the value of cultural awareness and diversity, 2) the development and relevance of authentic assessment, 3) the essentials of professional development, 4) the importance of mentoring and collaboration, 5) the significance of access to information, 6) the importance and application of research, 7) the value of leadership and effective practices, and 8) the significance of information and utilization of effective technology.

Utilizing the data collected and analyzed, plus the state praxis results to date, focus review summaries, and program exit surveys the following changes have been made to the District Level Leadership program. Note: Focus review groups are held every two years and exit survey data is collected and reviewed at the same time. Monthly faculty meetings are also used to review and discuss program data and requirements.

The KSDE District Level Program Report and Standards were revised and applied 2015 as changed by KSDE.

EA District Level courses and practicum changes include but are not limited to: a) activity involving KSDE Annual Reports and due dates, b) required district level central office candidates to attend one state level conference, c) require district level special education candidates to

attend one state or tri-state special education conference, d) encourage candidates to become members of administrator and special education professional organizations, e) provide information on negotiating teacher and administrator contracts as well as become knowledgeable of the negotiation process, and f) provide more group discussion and individual projects within the courses and practicum. In addition, the discussion of 'diversity' was identified as being taught within EA885, EA888, EA997/998 District Practicums, and ER752.

Additional clarifications and revisions were made relating to the practicum activities as well as including specific elements relating to special education and diversity.

Courses were reviewed to ensure that the new and revised state standards and Praxis content data are addressed and assessed within specific content areas. Assessments #1, #2, #4, and #5 were used to shape curriculum content within the program. In addition, biannual focus review assessment feedback, exit survey data, and comments from those completing the state assessment were used in and during each review.

From the 2016-2017 EA Focus review the following changes were made or topics stressed

-add curriculum and an activity dealing with administrators as change agents, add a discussion activity relating to interpreting and applying research findings, continue and maintain collaborative activities and discussion, and stress the need for administrators to work on skills needed in multiethnic settings as well as when working with 'at risk' students.

Throughout the 2014-2017 time frame, practicum (field experience) activities were realigned and revised to add specific field experience in diversity, specific district demographics, and a greater range of experiences within the area of special education. The KSDE report and evidence files are located in the file library.

Attached Files

- [TTC-SL-EA DISTRICT LEVEL-LIC](#)
- [District Assessment 2 Data Report 14-16 \(summers\)](#)
- [District Assessment 3 Data Report 14-17](#)
- [District Assessment 4 Data Report 14-16 \(summers\)](#)
- [District Assessment 5 Data Report 14-17](#)
- [District Assessment 6 Data Report 14-17](#)
- [District Assessment 7 Data Report 14-17](#)
- [KSDE Annual District Rpt August 2017](#)
- [District Appendix 2 Rubric for Assessment 2](#)
- [District Appendix 3 Rubric for Assessment 3](#)
- [District Appendix 4 Rubric for Assessment 4](#)
- [District Appendix 5 Rubric for Assessment 5](#)
- [District Appendix 6 Rubric for Assessment 6](#)
- [District Appendix 7 Rubric for Assessment 7](#)
- [District Assessment 1 Data Report 14-17](#)
- [District Appendix 2 Rubric for Assessment 2.doc](#)
- [District Appendix 4 Rubric for Assessment 4.doc](#)
- [District Appendix 5 Rubric for Assessment 5.doc](#)
- [District Appendix 6 Rubric for Assessment 6.doc](#)
- [District Appendix 7 Rubric for Assessment 7.doc](#)
- [District Assessment 1 Data Report 14-17.doc](#)
- [EA Dist Licensure Program of Study.doc](#)
- [District Appendix 3 Rubric for Assessment 3.doc](#)
- [District Assessment 3 Data Report 14-17.doc](#)
- [District Assessment 2 Data Report 14-16 \(summers\).doc](#)
- [District Assessment 4 Data Report 14-16 \(summers\).doc](#)
- [District Assessment 5 Data Report 14-17.doc](#)
- [District Assessment 6 Data Report 14-17.doc](#)
- [District Assessment 7 Data Report 14-17.doc](#)
- [ESU KSDE District Leadership Rpt.doc](#)

Program Name: Instructional Leadership MS

Summary of Program Assessments:

This program has been discontinued as per the Kansas Board of Regents policy.

Program Name: Master of Education in Teaching

Summary of Program Assessments:

AY 2018

No changes are planned for assessments in the Master of Education in Teaching. Based on student feedback, courses in this program have practical performance assessments that those taking the course create for their own classrooms. The ED888 Practicum/Action Research is an excellent culminating course and the Comprehensive Exam indicates student learning from their coursework.

AY 2017

Based on the most recent KSDE report, all assessments are aligned with departmental program standards, and Kansas Standards. The findings support that we are doing an excellent job meeting the State Standards in the Master of Education in Teaching Program (MEd) but there is room for improvement in the Comprehensive Examination (Part I & II subsections). During (2015-2016) two assessments of the comprehensive exam reported unsatisfactory ratings 1 for classroom management and 2 for authentic assessment.

The data indicates that 100% of all 2013-2016 program completers scored “Exemplary” in content based assessment. This is exceptional and faculty should be commended for their instructional efforts. All 40 candidates during the 2013-2016 reporting periods earned between a 4.0 and 3.5 grade point average in the identified core courses with a 4.0 being an ‘A’ and 3.5 being a ‘B+’ and rated as “exemplary”. This is evidence that all students are “Exemplary” in their content knowledge to effectively design, manage, align and evaluate instruction. Additionally, 100% of completers during the 2013 – 2016 reporting period scored “Exemplary” on the final course project for ED886, Designing Instructional Programs used to measure candidate’s ability to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction. This data indicates that all students are “Exemplary” in their ability to integrate technology into curriculum and instruction. Additionally, the data shows that program completers have demonstrated “exemplary” and “proficient” achievement in obtaining the identified skills and knowledge of an understanding of classroom management and creating a positive climate; in ability to understand and apply authentic assessment to improve student learning; and in inclusion of diversity in teaching and learning.

Future goals are to 1) continue providing high quality instruction for “Exemplary” learning and to achieve a minimum of “Proficient” learning in all identified assessments, 2) invite a panel of completers (approximately 6 to 8) to participate in a department program focus review bi-annually to discuss program strengths and areas for improvement, 3) review the comprehensive examination directions and make changes to improve clarity and mainstream for concision, 4) have students experience a problem solving scenario in one of their courses to help prepare them for section I on the comprehensive exam since 4 of the 2013-2014 and 7 of the 2014-2015 completers scored in the “Proficient” rating, and 2 of the 2015-2016 candidates scored unsatisfactory, requiring a rewrite), 5) have instructors review with students the comprehensive examination in one of the core courses taken the same semester they write the exam to provide clarity for directions, discuss expectations and address questions, and 6) provide faculty with scoring training to increase inter-rater reliability for the comprehensive examination.

Attached Files

- [TTC-SL-MASTER OF EDUCATION IN TEACHING-MED](#)
- [Attachment 2b Comprehensive Exam Q I MEd \(3\)](#)
- [Attachment 3b Comprehensive Exam Q II-C MEd](#)
- [Attachment 4b Comprehensive Exam Q II-B MEd 2015-2016](#)
- [Attachment 5b Technology ED886 Rubric 2015-2016](#)
- [Attachment 6b Comprehensive Exam Q II-E MEd](#)
- [ME.d Annual Report](#)
- [Appendix 3 Data Table for Comprehensive Exam Q2C MEd 2015-2016](#)
- [Appendix 4 Data Table for Comprehensive Exam Q2B MEd 2015-2016](#)
- [Appendix 5a Technology ED886 Final Project Score MEd 2015-2016](#)
- [Appendix 5b Technology ED886 Final Project MEd](#)
- [Appendix 6 Comprehensive Exam Q2E MEd 2015-2016](#)
- [Attachment 1b Core GPA Rubric MEd-1](#)
- [Appendix 2 Comprehensive Exam I MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Appendix 2 Comprehensive Exam PART II C MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Appendix 3 Comprehensive Exam PART II C MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Appendix 4 Comprehensive Exam PART II B MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Appendix 5 Technology ED886 Final Project MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Appendix 6 Comprehensive Exam PART II E MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data table Part 1 MEd 2013 2014 OLD](#)

- [Assessment 1 Data table Part 1 content based assessment Core GPA MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Assessment 1 Data table Part 1 Core GPA MEd 2013 2014](#)
- [Attachment 2b Comprehensive Exam Q I MEd](#)
- [Attachment 3b Comprehensive Exam Q II C MEd](#)
- [Attachment 4b Comprehensive Exam Q II B MEd](#)
- [Attachment 4b TWS Factors 5 7 Data 2011 2012 NA KSDE MED report](#)
- [Attachment 5b Comp Exam Data 2011 2012 NA KSDE MED report](#)
- [Attachment 6b Comprehensive Exam Q II E MEd](#)
- [Comp Evaluation Document for MEd NA KSDE MEd Report](#)
- [Data Rubric 1a MEd KSDE Report 2013 2014](#)

Program Name: Restricted Program Alternate Route

Summary of Program Assessments:

FY 2018

Students in the Restricted Alternate Route Program meet the state standards through their coursework, internship and by passing the Praxis exams. Feedback from students and mentors indicate the current assessment plan is effective so there are not any plans to change it for 2018. Based on the KSDE Report submitted in October 2017, Section V presents the strategies used to improve candidate and program performance and is shown as written in the report.

During 2016-2017, the following changes were made to the program: The Restricted License program merged into the Master of Education (MEd) degree as an option to gain a teaching license. Upon completion of the Restricted Licensure coursework (21 semester hours), a program completer can then move forward to complete the MEd degree. The Interns from this year were in the beginning of this change which also included securing an appropriate teaching position to be considered for the program as a first step. The gpa for the last 60 semester hours was also raised to a 3.0 to be consistent with other graduate degrees.

The major findings from the evidence is that ESU is doing an above average job of preparing interns during their first year of teaching under a Restricted License in middle schools and high schools or in elementary schools, if pursuing a PK-12 license content area. There is always room for improvement. The majority of our interns complete the Restricted License program piece of the MEd degree within one year and one summer. The remaining interns complete within one additional semester or take the allowable two-year period to complete. One strength is the interns' content knowledge with 100% passing the Praxis content test and 100% passing the Principles of Learning and Teaching test with a higher mean score than the previous two years, 2015-2016 and 2014-2015. The Teacher Work Sample scores from Fall 2016 indicated some room for improvement in the training and support for the 6 interns even though they were still above the 70% for the passing score with 3-6 interns reaching a proficient level in all 7 Factors and 1-3 interns needing improvement in Factors 4-7. Emporia State transitioned to the Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP) Spring 2017 with a 100% pass rate and edging above the ESU mean score by .04. The Assessment of Clinical Experience shows 9-12 Interns are Proficient in all categories with an average of 92.3%. In 3 areas (Part IA, Part IB, and Part II), 1-3 interns were adequate. This shows the interns are achieving good levels in all areas of their instruction.

The weakest areas according to Teacher Work Sample scores is in Factors 4 (Demonstration of Integration Skills), 5 (Analysis of Classroom Learning Environment), 5 (Analysis of Classroom Learning Environment), and 7 (Reflection and Self-Evaluation). The weakest area according to one semester of Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio scores is in Task #4 (Reflection and Professionalism). With Emporia State transitioning to the KPTP for the current academic year, we will continue to monitor these areas in the KPTP to determine additional need for emphasis and instruction for the performance assessment.

Feedback from interns indicates they are very satisfied with the program and would recommend it to others, and have done so in following years. At the end of the internship, the interns suggested what they felt was lacking or areas they need more training - opportunities to observe other teachers in the classroom environment prior to the internship year. A policy was implemented during the 2015-2016 academic year to require interns teaching in one level of their license level to observe or co-teach at the other license level within their discipline. For example, if an intern was hired to teach only at the middle school within a 6-12 license level, they must complete 4 hours of observation/co-teaching at the high school level. The top request for additional training is in the TWS, which will now be the KPTP moving forward. The scheduling of the 4 education courses are critical in helping the interns prepare for both their teaching assignment every day and also for completing the TWS/KPTP. The classes are carefully arranged to give interns the best information at the best possible time for this as well as for what they may experience in the classroom. Other interns did not have suggestions and felt the program was not lacking in anything. Our supervisors enjoy observing our interns and seeing their creativity in the classroom. However, we continue to monitor the intern feedback on a regular basis in the internship and from further data differences/similarities/trends, etc.

Surveys will be set up to send to mentor teachers and principals, if possible, to gain feedback about their experience in hiring a Restricted License intern. This will be to collect data for areas the interns need additional help or assistance from our program. There are districts that have hired more than one intern in the last year as well as districts in other areas of the state that have not hired our interns previously and

now have hired our interns. Strengthening the communication and partnership with these districts and more is another area to improve the program. Overall, the program is strong and improvements based on the data collected will continue to grow the program.

FY 2017

The major finding from the evidence is that we are doing an excellent job meeting the State Standards but there is room for improvement in some areas. One strength is the interns' content knowledge with 100% passing the Praxis II content test (Standards #1 & 7: Content Knowledge) and 100% passing the Principles of Learning and Teaching test with 86% average demonstrating their knowledge of learning and teaching (Standard #2: How Individuals Learn and Standard #3 Development Levels). Teaching the lesson (94%) incorporates several standards and professionalism fulfilling Standards 9 & 10 (93.8%); these are the two categories showing high rating from mentors and supervisors. In addition, these students did outstanding work on their Teacher Work Samples (93.98% average) and on the course plans they developed with a 98.2% average (Standards #3 & #7: Instructional Planning).

The weakest area according to the mentors and supervisors was managing the classroom (89%). The Teacher Work Sample indicated the lowest area was Factor 7, Reflection and Self-Evaluation (86.45%). A low scoring area on the PLT test was Category V. Analysis of Instruction. These two factors indicate interns need to improve in self-reflection and evaluation of their instruction.

Examination of the data indicates the areas that could improve candidate performance and strengthen the program are to work with interns on self reflection since that was a low score on both the clinical experience and the Teacher Work Sample. Our supervisors and mentors will be asked to check for this and emphasize the importance; it will also be addressed at seminars and in ED 893 Internship I. Managing the classroom was the lowest percentage for clinical experience, so our seminars will continue to have sessions on classroom management with scenarios for interns to enact. We will enlist the help of Principals, Mentors and Instructional Coaches for those interns who need more assistance in classroom management. A discussion with the instructor for ED 879 Classroom Management resulted in additional ideas for that class. We also added a seminar workshop on technology in the classroom as that was another area that needed more emphasis and instruction. Changes made are an addition to the Designing Instructional Programs Course to include more assignments with Common Core Standards and

student reflection on their assignments. A new instructor was hired for the Designing Instructional Programs Course; this is a person who has been working in the field and will bring new expertise into the course. A session on Common Core Standards was added to the seminars. A longer session on the Teacher Work Sample was conducted and two sessions using technology were added to the seminars. Feedback from the interns indicated 92.3% were "Extremely Satisfied" with the program and 100% would recommend it to others. One student felt the program was not the best fit personally but would recommend it to others. At the end of their internship the interns suggested what they felt was lacking or areas they need more training. The following are their number one requests: more training for the Teacher Work Sample and the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam, and classroom management strategies. All the Principals except one were very enthused about the caliber of interns and indicated they would hire an alternate route intern again. One school that didn't renew an intern's contract indicated they would hire another alternate route intern even though this one didn't work out.

A small number of Principals indicated there were some classroom management issues but most said there was improvement throughout the year. The mentors felt it was a positive experience with very little difference from supervising a student teacher. All the mentors said they would supervise an alternate route intern again. Overall, the program is strong and we will continue to make improvements based on the data collected.

Attached Files

- [Attach 1a Praxis Cont Scores No Names 2013 2014 1](#)
- [Attach 1b Praxis PLT No Names 2013 2014 1](#)
- [Attach 2b Course Plan Data No Names 2013 2014 1](#)
- [Attach 3b Clinical Exp Assmt No Names 2013 2014 1](#)
- [Attach 4b TWS No Names 2013 2014 1](#)
- [Attachment 1a Praxis Cont Data 2011 2014 1](#)
- [Attachment 1b PLT Data 1](#)
- [Attachment 2a Rubrics for Course Planning ED886 1](#)
- [Attachment 2b Data Table 2011 2014 1](#)
- [Attachment 3 Clinical Experience Data Eval form 2010 2013 1](#)
- [Attachment 4a 4b TWS data 2011 2014 1](#)
- [Attachmment 4a TWS Rubric 1](#)
- [ReportTable all data](#)
- [Assessment 1a-Praxis Content.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 2 Rubric TWS 1-4.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 2 - KPTP Tasks 1 and 2.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 2 and 4-Data Table TWS Scores 2016-2017.pdf](#)

- [Assessment 2b-4b-Data Table KPTP Assessment.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 1c PLT Data 2016-2017.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 3 Clinical Exp -Eval 2016-2017.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 3b-Clinical Exp Assmt Data Table.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 4 Rubric TWS 5-7.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 4 - KPTP Tasks 3 and 4.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 5 Syllabus for 841.pdf](#)
- [Assessment 5 Data Table 2016-2017.pdf](#)
- [Restricted Program KSDE Report 2016-2017.docx](#)
- [RL Plan of Study for Schl Co.Lib Media.pdf](#)
- [RL Plan of Study for Teachers.pdf](#)

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

There are some encouraging program adaptations occurring in the Secondary Teacher Education Program. The increased student-contact time in Phase I for pre-service teacher candidates will better prepare them for the rigors of lesson planning for a variety of learner groups. The graduate programs faculty will be focused on transitioning to an accelerated format for delivery of our online educational administration and curriculum and instruction programs. The new 7-week course format will begin in the 2018 fall term. The adaptations to courses and faculty will be a challenge as we monitor enrollments in these two programs. It is anticipated that growth will occur as marketing of these programs has been increased as well. The assessment practices for these programs will remain consistent and the course curricula, student learning outcomes, and rigor have not been affected by the transition. The Building and District Level Praxis Licensure examination passing rates is a testimony to the quality and effectiveness of the teaching and learning for these two graduate programs.

The School Leadership department is in a state of transition as it prepares for these changes in the delivery of instruction, but our assessment plans in place for our certifications, licensure, and degree programs are solid. The curriculum maps identify some areas where assessments can be prioritized and of course those change strategies to align assessment with both KSDE and CAEP standards will be important as well.

Navigating the transitions to the accelerated programs will require some monitoring of current assessment practices. It will depend on how you have the data collection points and the accumulation of the assessment data captured in the processes. For those assessments embedded in the Canvas courses, the transition should be smooth, however the acceleration of the course time frames will provide a double amount of data collected for your course assessments. The certification and licensure Praxis tests will remain the same in collecting and reporting score ranges and means. Another detail you will need to consider is making changes to the curriculum. It may be beneficial to build curriculum change timelines into the existing carousel framework. You may also be constrained by the AP in regard to the frequency of curriculum changes. It may be worthy of a conversation ahead of time to plan when you are able to make curriculum adaptations. Keeping the curriculum current in a carousel format may prove to be your challenge in the grand scheme of things.

You had a few faculty assess their courses using the Course Level Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Reporting tool. I'm unsure that there was intent in the process as there wasn't much written reflection or improvement strategies mentioned at all. I'm hoping that we can have some genuine dialog about the requirements for faculty to assess their courses and how this meshes with existing assessment practices in our programs. It will be a topic of interest for our SLAC group as we move forward into the 2019 academic year. I appreciate the assessment efforts of your faculty in ensuring the quality of the programs and the requirements of the KSDE and CAEP accreditation standards. Nice dedication on your assessment practices!

Academic Year 2017

This past academic year was a very productive year as the Kansas Department of Education (KSDE) reports and the data supporting the assessments and findings were completed for submission during the summer of 2017. The amount and quality of assessments and related reporting for the department as a whole were very impressive. After reviewing all of the reports and the supporting data files, it is shown that the department faculty continue to educate students at very high levels of competency. The vast majority of all students are scoring exemplary on both course embedded assessments and licensure exams. The few areas where some room for improvement were discovered as outcomes of comprehensive assessment practices were addressed and integrated into future year change strategies. The changes to the way that data are collected by supervising teachers and evaluators using the survey tool in baseline has maximized the value of the inputs and evaluations and has created efficiency's in the summative analyses processes. The curricular changes to improve comprehensive exam performance for completers will benefit the successes of the graduates. As will, an extended emphasis placed on applied practices in classroom management experiences. The adaptive changes to enable students to refine their skills to self-reflect and evaluate their own instruction will also greatly benefit future educators. Finally, the additional emphasis on technology use and understanding of diversity will

strengthen the curriculum across all majors. The ways in which you triangulate your assessment data (Teacher Work Samples, Praxis Test Scores, Student Focus Groups, Evaluator Feedback, and Faculty Discussions) is a departmental strength! Continue to encourage your faculty to participate and share expertise in assessment practices, you have developed a very comprehensive strategy in maintaining high quality and currency in the respective fields. Keep up the good work!

Academic Year 2016

The School Leadership department is in a state of transition as it adapts to new standards by the KSDE. The assessment plans in place for these certification, licensure, and degree programs are solid. The curriculum maps may identify some areas where assessments can be prioritized and of course those change strategies to align assessment with both KSDE and CAEP standards will be important as well. It is anticipated that AY 2017 will be a year of changes in assessment please attach all data files and other documents as they become available. It will be important to ensure that assessments at the course level continue to occur during the transitions. The work being done is good, keep up the continuous assessment planning!

Academic Year 2015

The assessments required by the Kansas Department of Education direct the curricula and drive improvement strategies for all of the programs in the School Leadership department. There are some opportunities that may exist for assessing various individual courses within the curriculum that are not included in the KSDE assessments. These may be some of the first courses a student completes in the program. In studying patterns of student success within courses taught by department faculty, there were not any indications that problematic courses existed. Other things to consider for assessment would include course sequencing and advising strategies. With the graduate programs being online, it will be important to spend adequate time providing faculty professional development opportunities as the electronic delivery mediums and the ways in which students learn continue to evolve quickly. It is acknowledged that faculty must stay abreast of the changes that occur related to required licensure exams, as students' performances are tracked as part of the KSDE reporting. Overall, the assessment program is sound, and the program is serving as a change agent. It's assumed that new results will be forthcoming once the new KSDE and CAEP standards are applied and I'm looking forward to reviewing them.

Attached Files

[JK GRADES ANALYSIS FOR ED LEADERSHIP 8-11-15](#)

Providing Department: School Leadership/ Middle and Secondary Teacher Education

Responsible Roles:

Daniel Stiffler (E11076536), Shannon Hall (E10323717), Darcy Stevens (E10261373), Jerry Will (E10087874), Kirsten Limpert (E10293634), Nancy Albrecht (E10087927), Paul Bland (E10000465), Joan Brewer (E10000569), Ed Church (E10000847), John Morton (E10893123)

UNIT REPORT

University Libraries and Archives Assessment Report 2018

Generated: 10/24/18, 11:31 AM

**University Libraries and Archives Assessment Plan****Describe Annual Assessment Plans:****AY 2018**

The ESU University Libraries and Archives (ULA) is using again the American Library Association - Association of College and Research Libraries [Standards for Libraries in Higher Education](#) as the conceptual framework for its continuous assessment of resources and services to the ESU community and beyond. In AY2018, we are focusing upon four standards:

- **Educational Role:** Libraries partner in the educational mission of the institution to develop and support information-literate learners who can discover, access, and use information effectively for academic success, research, and lifelong learning.
- **Discovery:** Libraries enable users to discover information in all formats through effective use of technology and organization of knowledge.
- **Collections:** Libraries provide access to collections sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, format, and currency to support the research and teaching missions of the institution.
- **Space:** Libraries are the intellectual commons where users interact with ideas in both physical and virtual environments to expand learning and facilitate the creation of new knowledge.

AY 2017

Continuing the plan of utilizing the American Library Association – Association of College and Research Libraries' [Standards for Libraries in Higher Education](#), the ESU Libraries and Archives have identified four of the nine Standards that fit into the context of assessment projects for the 2016/17 academic year. The four standards assessed this year are:

- **Educational Role:** Libraries partner in the educational mission of the institution to develop and support information-literate learners who can discover, access, and use information effectively for academic success, research, and lifelong learning.
- **Discovery:** Libraries enable users to discover information in all formats through effective use of technology and organization of knowledge.
- **Collections:** Libraries provide access to collections sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, format, and currency to support the research and teaching missions of the institution.
- **Space:** Libraries are the intellectual commons where users interact with ideas in both physical and virtual environments to expand learning and facilitate the creation of new knowledge.

AY 2016

In the ESU Libraries and Archives (ULA) Assessment Report for the 2014/15 academic year, we noted that we were using an external set of institutional criteria in order to measure impact upon student learning outcomes. The criteria are outlined in the American Library Association - Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) [Standards for Libraries in Higher Education](#). Approved by the ACRL Board in October 2011, the Standards aid academic libraries to "demonstrate their value and document their contributions to overall institutional effectiveness and be prepared to address changes in higher education."

This report for the 2015/16 academic year identifies five of the nine Standards as well as a matching performance indicator from each Standard that best illustrates the outcome for a correlating activity.

AY 2015

The Emporia State University Libraries and Archives (ULA) in 2014/15 embarked upon several initiatives to gain a more comprehensive sense of annual contributions to student learning. For the purposes of this document, we are using an external set of standards and performance indicators for a beginning assessment template and for future assessment planning.

The American Library Association - Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) in 2011 published its Standards for Libraries in Higher Education. The Standards "are designed to guide academic libraries in advancing and sustaining their role as partners in educating students, achieving their institutions' missions, and positioning libraries as leaders in assessment and continuous improvement on their campuses. Libraries must demonstrate their value and document their contributions to overall institutional effectiveness and be prepared to address changes in higher education."

Nine principles are at the heart of the Standards:

Institutional Effectiveness: Libraries define, develop, and measure outcomes that contribute to institutional effectiveness and apply findings for purposes of continuous improvement.

Professional Values: Libraries advance professional values of intellectual freedom, intellectual property rights and values, user privacy and confidentiality, collaboration, and user-centered service.

Educational Role: Libraries partner in the educational mission of the institution to develop and support information-literate learners who can discover, access, and use information effectively for academic success, research, and lifelong learning.

Discovery: Libraries enable users to discover information in all formats through effective use of technology and organization of knowledge.

Collections: Libraries provide access to collections sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, format, and currency to support the research and teaching mission of the institution.

Space: Libraries are the intellectual commons where users interact with ideas in both physical and virtual environments to expand learning and facilitate the creation of new knowledge.

Management/Administration: Libraries engage in continuous planning and assessment to inform resource allocation and to meet their mission effectively and efficiently.

Personnel: Libraries provide sufficient number of quality of personnel to ensure excellence and to function successfully in an environment of continuous change.

External Relations: Libraries engage the campus and broader community through multiple strategies in order to advocate, educate, and promote their value.

In this 2014/15 Assessment Plan, we outline the progress of ULA in each of the nine principles and certain corresponding performance indicators from the ACRL Standards. It is the hope of ULA that this plan will also serve as a roadmap for the future assessment projects crosswalked with the ESU Strategic Plan and four Goals.

Start: 07/01/2015

End: 06/30/2025

Department Summary, Strategies, and Next Steps:

AY 2018

The ethnographic study of library building use by patrons will continue in AY 2018, along with continuing assessment of the change in classification systems to Library of Congress and the weeding/rightsizing of the print library collection.

A major contribution to the Educational Role standard that will be implemented in Fall 2018 and evaluated throughout AY 2018 is a new software component, EBSCO's Curriculum Builder. Curriculum Builder is integrated with the Canvas learning management system and enables a faculty member to create electronic reading lists for students by searching for full text of articles and other materials readily available in the library's electronic resources. The library has already paid for educational copyright clearances via database subscriptions and license agreements with vendors, so Curriculum Builder also helps with copyright/intellectual property concerns. ULA faculty will be working with Curriculum Builder in their UL100 courses during AY 2018 as well as teaching other faculty the use of the software in their own courses. We will provide an analysis of usage statistics and overall satisfaction with Curriculum Builder in the AY 2018 assessment report.

AY 2017

The Libraries and Archives Dean, Michelle Hammond, has now been in her position for a little under a year. The above updates and assessment demonstrate a new, positive direction for ULA. As noted, further planned assessments of services, resources, and space will continue to help shape the future of ULA in the overall context of the Emporia State University Strategic Plan.

AY 2016

While our ongoing assessment will not change, we are also looking forward to the arrival of a new University Libraries and Archives Dean (Michelle Hammond) in August 2016. As a result, priorities for assessment projects may change and we will remain flexible accordingly.

AY 2015

The ESU Libraries and Archives has started thinking more about assessment as a continuous cycle of improvement with the completion of its Assessment Plan for 2014-15. In particular, the use of the ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education with its principles, performance indicators, and sample outcomes helped greatly in focusing our assessment efforts for every project, service, and resource as they contribute to student learning.

However, like all efforts, we could be much more targeted in our assessment plan. We want to perform at our best in every endeavor, but in this desire we often lose track of smaller, more frequent activities that also need to be evaluated in order to determine their continued effectiveness.

In August 2015, I (as the Director of Assessment) met with the department heads of High Tech, Distinctive Primary Sources, and Lifelong Learning in the Libraries and Archives. These areas perform the bulk of instruction, reference, processing of materials, and access to/preservation of information. To start an assessment plan for 2015/16, I sensed that I needed to learn much more about the collection and compilation of data that were already occurring in the departments. After meeting with the department heads, I created and sent them spreadsheets for their areas to complete by Friday, September 11, 2015. The spreadsheets ask for each department:

Type of Data (collected/compiled)

Frequency of Collection (daily; weekly; monthly; quarterly; etc.)

Format/software used for collection

Usage of statistics (scheduling; purchasing; other decision-making)

Notes/Comments

I will collate the information on the spreadsheets into a larger, publicly accessible document for the Libraries and Archives faculty and staff to see any connections among departments in order to help with common assessment questions and decision-making informed by data in other areas.

Another goal for the 2015/16 assessment plan to identify more specifically the goal or goals from the ESU Strategic Plan that “crosswalk” with the Libraries and Archives’ vision and mission. I noted in the 2014/15 assessment plan that ULA had a draft strategic plan written and presented in December 2014. That draft plan has yet to be reviewed by the rest of the ULA faculty and staff, but the task force writing the plan intentionally connected goals, outcomes, and performance indicators to the ESU Strategic Plan. There is still much information in the draft plan that could be revisited, rewritten, and most importantly, prioritized in terms of the activities that most demonstrate the value of the Libraries and Archives to ESU and to student learning for the common good. We will continue to utilize the ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Education as our professional standard and guideline, but in 2015/16 we truly need to choose a few priorities that we can fairly easily assess for “lessons learned”, and to know for sure what we are doing well for the University.

Attached Files

[ULA_General-Education-Course-Specific-Embedded_Assessments-AY2016-2017](#)

[Assessments for Core Skills UL 100 Faculty 2016](#)

[ABI_Inform](#)

[American_Chemical_Society_Journals](#)

[American_Reference_Books_Annual](#)

[Annual_Reviews](#)

[Biological_Abstracts_and_MEDLINE](#)

[BioMed](#)

[BioOne](#)

[BioOne_2](#)

[Birds_of_North_America](#)

[Book_Review_Digest_Retrospective](#)

[Books_in_Print](#)

[Business_Source_Premier](#)

[CINAHL_with_Full_Text](#)

[Communication_and_Mass_Media_Complete](#)

[CQ_Researcher](#)
[Criminal Justice Abstracts](#)
[Dissertations and Theses Full Text](#)
[Dissertations at ESU](#)
[Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science](#)
[Faculty Awareness Survey Results Spring 2015](#)
[FIS_Mergent](#)
[International Index to Music Periodicals](#)
[Library Literature Full Text](#)
[Library Literature Retrospective](#)
[MathSciNet](#)
[Mental Measurements Yearbook](#)
[Mental Measurements Yearbook with Tests in Print](#)
[Naxos Music Library](#)
[News Article - News Emporia State University](#)
[Philosophers Index](#)
[Physical Education Index](#)
[Proquest Nursing and Allied Health](#)
[PsycINFO and PsycARTICLES](#)
[RILM](#)
[Scifinder](#)
[Senior High Core Collection](#)
[SocINDEX with Full Text](#)
[Something about the Author](#)
[SportDISCUS with Full Text](#)
[Kane-Cynthia-UL100-FA17.pdf](#)
[Mahoney-Megan-UL100-SP18.pdf](#)
[O'Dell-Bethanie-UL100-FA17.pdf](#)
[Summey-Terri-UL100-FA18.pdf](#)
[O'Dell-Bethanie-UL100-SP18.pdf](#)

Program Name : Institutional Effectiveness

Summary of Program Assessments:

1. Institutional Effectiveness: Libraries define, develop, and measure outcomes that contribute to institutional effectiveness and apply findings for purposes of continuous improvement. This area is narrated based on current year outcomes assessments as shown.

AY 2018: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2017: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2016

1.5 The library articulates how it contributes to student learning, collects evidence, documents successes, shares results, and makes improvements.

Since the spring of 2009, ULA has offered an undergraduate course that satisfies the ESU General Education outcome of “Information Technology”. The course is UL100, Research Skills, Information, and Technology, and is a 2-credit-hour course taught by ULA faculty in a number of formats. Sections are offered as a traditional face to face semester course, an 8 week face to face block course, and completely online for a semester, 6 week, or 8 week block.

ULA has administered two types of standardized information literacy assessments in UL100 since the Fall 2012 semester. In 2012/13, we utilized a product called iSkills from the Educational Testing Service as a pre-test and post-test in UL100 sections. While iSkills had the advantage of web-based scenarios for critical thinking, overall the test did not correlate effectively with the student learning outcomes established for the course. Consequently, ULA faculty were not able to judge successfully various improvements in students’ actual learning versus the types of questions on the iSkills pre-test and post-test. An example was a question regarding the analysis of a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, a competency not taught in UL100.

We spent the summer of 2013 exploring other options for standardized information literacy assessment and decided upon a test called Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills). Project SAILS was originally developed by librarians at Kent State

University and is now owned by Carrick Enterprises. It is a multiple-choice test of items based upon the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards (2000).

Project SAILS has been administered as a pre-test and post-test in UL100 sections from Fall 2013 through Summer 2016. Project SAILS scores are benchmarked against peer institutions and the results are reported in terms of percentages. 55 items are used to calculate results. Correct answers of 70% and above are considered "Proficiency" and correct answers of 85% or above are "Mastery". Any scores below 70% are "Below Proficiency." The pre-tests and post-tests are compared each semester by section and collectively. An analysis, though, revealed some of the same difficulties that plagued our use of iSkills. Some Project SAILS items do not necessarily match UL100 student learning outcomes. For instance, one item asks students about the Library of Congress Classification System, which is not used in ULA and is most likely not familiar to the typical lower-division undergraduate student taking UL100. Similar items tend to lower pre-test and post-test scores artificially. We found as a result that students might remain at a Project SAILS rating of "Below Competency" in the pre-test and the post-test, but might have moved from "Below Competency" to "Competency" or "Mastery" if we recalculated by removing the items that were skewing the scores to a lower level. Our major concern was that overall, the Project SAILS pre-test and post-test results were not really an accurate representation of student learning across the UL100 curriculum.

The ULA faculty decided in Spring 2016 to explore a new option from Carrick Enterprises. Project SAILS now offers a product called Build Your Own Test. Institutions can customize a test from a validated bank of 162 questions, selecting up to 50 test questions. The questions are cross-referenced to the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards and to 8 Project SAILS Skill Sets:

Developing a Research Strategy

Selecting Finding Tools

Searching

Using Finding Tool Features

Retrieving Sources

Evaluating Sources

Documenting Sources

Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues

Three ULA faculty are working this summer on selecting 50 test questions that best match UL100 student learning outcomes. The test questions will be vetted by the rest of the ULA faculty and the Build Your Own Test option will be deployed in UL100 sections as a pre-test and post-test beginning in the Fall 2016 semester. The faculty will then review the scores at the end of the Fall 2016 semester in order to assess changes in the Below Proficiency, Proficiency, and Mastery results due to the use of BYOT.

1.7 The library communicates with the campus community to highlight its value in the educational mission and in institutional effectiveness.

The Leave Your Legacy initiative from the Special Collections and Archives department in ULA is a way for students currently enrolled at ESU to donate materials reflecting student life and activities. The project is constantly being assessed in terms of the number of materials donated and increasing overall awareness of Special Collections and Archives across campus. In Fall 2015 a student assistant with marketing experience was asked to review the initiative. Several of her suggestions were implemented, including monthly Leave Your Legacy days and targeting specific groups for collaboration, including leadership, student government, and athletes. A chapter about the Leave Your Legacy initiative was written by three personnel in Special Collections and Archives:

- Ashley Todd-Diaz, former Curator
- Shari Scribner, Assistant Archivist
- Kylie Lewis, former Public Services Supervisor

The chapter will be published by the Association for College and Research Libraries in *Students Lead the Library: The Importance of Student Contributions to the Academic Library* (2016). Writing the chapter allowed us to assess the initiative from its beginning and develop future strategies which include taking Leave Your Legacy wherever the students are – such as the dormitories and academic buildings – and working with additional student organizations and classes.

A second project in Special Collections and Archives will help in highlighting value to the campus community. Departments, offices and organizations across campus are creating more digital records; in fact, some do not create any other kind of record. It was necessary for these records to either be printed onto paper or saved on a physical medium such as a flash drive or CD in order for them to be added to the

University's historical records. To facilitate the collection of digital records, in 2015/16 the Special Collections and Archives staff worked with Information Technology personnel to develop a Skybox app called "Archives Submissions." This app allows departments, offices, and organizations to easily transfer their digital records to Special Collections and Archives. Advertising this technology and encouraging its use continues to be an ongoing process and will be critical to our being able to successfully collect the digital records created by ESU faculty, staff, and students.

AY 2015

1. Program Effectiveness

1.2. The library develops outcomes that are aligned with institutional, departmental, and student affairs outcomes.

In the fall of 2014, a Strategic Plan Task Force continued its work of writing a draft University

Libraries and Archives Strategic Plan with articulated crosswalks with the 2015-2025 ESU Strategic Plan, "The Adaptive University". The plan includes a number of objectives, strategies, and performance indicators to lead an Adaptive Library for the next ten years. While the plan is still in a draft form and has not been formally approved, it is a start for annual assessments aligned with institutional, departmental, and student affairs outcomes.

1.3. The library develops outcomes that are aligned with accreditation guidelines for the institution.

This performance indicator was an integral part of ESU's recent accreditation report from the Higher Learning Commission. ESU is one of the last institutions to be re-accredited under the PEAQ Criteria for Accreditation (<https://www.ncahlc.org/Criteria-Eligibility-and-candidacy/criteria-and-corecomponents.html>)

Specifically, library resources and services are addressed in the following HLC criterion and core component:

3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).

The HLC Self-Study Report from ESU addressed this criterion and core component as written by the Director of Assessment, ULA.

However, contributions from ULA were also highlighted in the Self-Study Report for:

4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum. While the HLC Self-Study Report covered ESU's activities from 2004 to early 2014, for the future ULA must be focused upon learning outcomes that mesh with upcoming national accreditation requirements. At this writing, ESU is waiting to learn if the university will be recommended for HLC's Standard Pathways or Open Pathways accreditation system. Whatever the recommendation, there will be a more focused HLC visit to ESU in four years and ULA needs to work toward establishing, maintaining, assessing, and reworking outcomes for this new approach.

Attached Files

[University Libraries and Archives Draft Strategic Plan 2015-2025](#)

Program Name : Professional Values

Summary of Program Assessments:

2. Professional Values: Libraries advance professional values of intellectual freedom, intellectual property rights and values, user privacy and confidentiality, collaboration, and user-centered service.

AY 2018: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2017: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2016

Assessments in AY2016 were not directed towards Professional Values topics. These assessment efforts will occur in the future.

AY 2015

2.4. The library supports academic integrity and deters plagiarism through policy and education.

ULA addressed this performance indicator in 2014/15 in the following ways:

--In our credit course, UL100 (Information Literacy and Technology), chapter 6 of our textbook is titled "Manage: Using Information

Effectively and Ethically". The module that accompanies this chapter covers the U.S. Copyright Act, and intellectual property and open access issues. Local concerns such as the ESU Information Technology policy for all faculty, staff, and students are related in this module to real-life situations that students will encounter. An example of a situation is the Fair Use Act in copyright law as it applies to the use of scanners and copiers. Ethical use of information is also taught in UL100 in the context of citation styles and appropriate citing of information when writing papers and projects.

--Citation styles, and in particular the strengths and drawbacks of "citation tools" in electronic databases and Web sites, are integral parts of ULA's individual library instruction sessions for general education courses and upper-division discipline-specific courses.

--In Fall 2014, three ULA faculty partnered with the Graduate School to offer a series of workshops for graduate students. Under the general heading of "Cite It Right", the workshops covered general concepts of citation styles, the free bibliographic software programs of Zotero and Mendeley for citation management and organization, and specialized assistance in the American Psychological Association (APA) and Modern Language Association (MLA) citation styles. The workshops were recorded and made available at the Graduate School website, <http://www.emporia.edu/grad/> The attendance at each workshop averaged to about 15 students per workshop. Student evaluations from the workshops indicated an overall high level of satisfaction with the information presented, and a desire for additional workshops from ULA focusing upon selecting databases and search strategies for specific research topics.

Program Name : Educational Role

Summary of Program Assessments:

3. Educational Role: Libraries partner in the educational mission of the institution to develop and support information-literate learners who can discover, access, and use information effectively for academic success, research, and lifelong learning.

AY 2018

3.2 Library personnel collaborate with faculty to embed information literacy learning outcomes into curricula, courses, and assignments.

3.4 Library personnel provide appropriate and timely instruction in a variety of contexts and employ multiple learning platforms and pedagogy's.

The most visible outcome from ULA illustrating these two performance indicators was the approval in AY 2018 of a major curriculum change in UL100 (Research Skills, Information, and Technology). Based upon continuous feedback from previous UL100 students in the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction course evaluations, ULA faculty had had a sense for years that the UL100 curriculum could easily be expanded from two to three credit hours. We also knew that such a credit hour increase would make the course more marketable and competitive with other ESU courses that fulfill the "Information Literacy and Technology" General Education requirement. Finally, we were interested in mapping UL100 student learning outcomes and rubrics to the new Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) [Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education](#) (adopted by ACRL on January 11, 2016). The Framework is much more complex and conceptual in its approach than the former ACRL [Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education](#) (2000), which formerly had been the basis for our UL100 curriculum. This complexity could not be adequately taught or evaluated in a two-hour course.

With the approval of UL100 being offered for three credit hours going forward, the ULA faculty are presently spending Summer 2018 in revising the UL100 curriculum according to the *Framework*. We will be rewriting student learning outcomes, assignments, and assessment measures such as rubrics and other formative and summative feedback to implement in our UL100 sections beginning Fall 2018. We are offering 5 face-to-face sections and one completely online section, and we will be studying linkages in Canvas of learning outcomes and rubrics as well.

In the AY 2017 report, there is a reference to our move in UL100 standardized testing from Project SAILS to the [Threshold Achievement Test of Information Literacy](#) (TATIL) as a pre-test and post-test of UL100 students' information literacy skills. From the ULA faculty meeting on June 7, 2017 in which the Director of Instruction and Assessment presented aggregate results of the TATIL pilot project, the faculty decided beginning Fall 2017 to use the following TATIL modules as pre-tests and post-tests in UL100:

- Evaluating Process and Authority
- Strategic Searching

(The same test items/questions are used for both the pre-tests and the post-tests.)

In Fall 2017:

- 109 students took the Evaluating Process and Authority pre-test, and 98 students took the post-test.
- 116 students took the Strategic Searching pre-test, and 97 students took the post-test.

In Spring 2018:

- 96 students took the Evaluating Process and Authority pre-test, and 81 students took the post-test.
- 97 students took the Strategic Searching pre-test, and 80 students took the post-test.

The TATIL modules match to the ACRL *Framework* and testing emphasis is placed upon knowledge practices and "dispositions" of test-takers to engage in productive persistence, responsibility to community, toleration for ambiguity, and mindful self-reflection when faced with information challenges. Because of this emphasis, it is possible to see students' movement in these directions between the pre-tests and the post-tests. However, it is virtually impossible to measure the exact improvement in each test item from the pre-tests to the post-tests. This situation is in fact intentional both on the part of TATIL and the ACRL *Framework*.

Looking toward AY 2019, the Director of Instruction and Assessment is currently pulling data from the student keys of the students who took both the pre-tests and post-tests in AY 2018. ULA faculty can then consider any changes overall in these students' knowledge practices and dispositions in order to modify future UL100 learning outcomes and assessments accordingly.

AY 2017

3.4 Library personnel provide regular instruction in a variety of contexts and employ multiple learning platforms and pedagogies.

Much of the ULA faculty's time this academic year was spent in re-visioning various aspects of our General Education course, UL100 (Research Skills, Information, and Technology). As a reminder, this course is a two-credit-hour course that students may take to fulfill the "Information Technology" Core Skills General Education requirement at ESU.

One project accomplished in late Fall 2016 by ULA faculty was a revision of UL100 student learning outcomes in order to align more specifically with the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education. The Framework was adopted by the ACRL Board on January 11, 2016 with a simultaneous rescission of the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. The Framework is not designed as a series of outcomes in and of itself, but reflects key aspects of information literacy:

- Authority Is Constructed and Contextual
- Information Creation as a Process
- Information Has Value
- Research as Inquiry
- Scholarship as Conversation
- Searching as Strategic Exploration

The last time that UL100 learning outcomes had been slightly reworked was in Fall 2013, and in that time frame much had changed in terms of digital literacy, metaliteracies, and overall information literacy competencies for students in an era of social media "fake news" and "clickbait". The new UL100 learning outcomes, as follows, were implemented in the Spring 2017 UL100 sections:

At the end of the course, UL100 students will be able to:

- Define, narrow, and focus a topic for any research need
- Develop the skills necessary to access information effectively and efficiently
- Apply critical thinking skills such as interpreting scholarly materials, considering multiple perspectives, and using reason and evidence in the evaluation of information
- Analyze and synthesize information for the purpose of creating new knowledge
- Cite sources in a format recognized by professional colleagues in scholarly communication
- Identify ethical, legal, and social issues reflecting the changing nature of information in a technological society

Another change in UL100 based upon review and discussion with ULA faculty involved the Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) test. Since the fall of 2013, ULA faculty have utilized Project SAILS (a multiple-choice online test) in UL100 as a pre-test and a post-test of UL100 students' information literacy competencies throughout the semester or 8-week block. In the summer of 2016, a new option for the Project SAILS pre-test and post-test called Build Your Own Test (BYOT) became available through Carrick Enterprises, the company that sponsors Project SAILS. The BYOT allows libraries to select up to 45 questions from the Project SAILS test bank to use for individual testing. ULA faculty decided to try the BYOT option, using the same 45 questions for pre-testing and post-testing, in UL100 sections during the 2016-17 academic year. Faculty chose the BYOT questions based upon the revised UL100 learning outcomes.

As of this writing, pre-test and post-test results are available for the Fall 2016 and the Spring 2017 semesters. The Spring 2017 semester also presented another opportunity to assess UL100 students' progress in student learning outcomes in a slightly different context. Carrick Enterprises is planning to keep Project SAILS active for now, but also due to the adoption by ACRL of the Framework for Information

Literacy for Higher Education, a new testing option of information literacy competencies is currently being piloted. The Threshold Achievement Test of Information Literacy, or TATIL, is centered around critical thinking and problem-solving skills. There are presently four TATIL modules in the testing phase, correlating to the ACRL Framework as follows:

TATIL Module	ACRL Information Literacy Frame(s)
Evaluating Process and Authority	“Information Creation as a Process” and “Authority is Constructed and Contextual”
Strategic Searching	“Searching as Strategic Exploration”
Research and Scholarship	“Research as Inquiry” and “Scholarship as a Conversation”
The Value of Information	“Information Has Value”

In Spring 2017, there were four UL100 sections taught. Two of the sections used the Project SAILS BYOT option as a pre-test and a post-test. The remaining two sections, taught by the same ULA faculty member, used the “Strategic Searching” pilot module in TATIL as a pre-test and a post-test. This module was selected in collaboration with the Director of Assessment and the ULA faculty member teaching these sections.

Going forward, the ULA Director of Assessment is working on an aggregate analysis of both semesters’ results with Project SAILS and the TATIL Strategic Searching module in order to assess any changes, positive or negative, in test scores and actual learning progress with the UL100 outcomes. The report will be presented at a ULA faculty retreat on June 7, 2017 and discussion will include whether to stay with Project SAILS or move toward one or more TATIL modules to continue pre-tests and post-tests of UL100 students’ mastery of information literacy skills.

AY 2016

3.2 Library personnel collaborate with faculty to embed information literacy learning outcomes into curricula, courses, and assignments

In the 2015/16 academic year, the Lifelong Learning department of ULA focused attention upon the concept of embedded librarianship.

This area is an approach that “emphasizes the importance of forming a strong working relationship between the librarian and a group or team of people who need the librarian’s information expertise. As the relationship develops, the librarian’s knowledge and understanding of the group’s work and objectives grow, which leads in turn to greater alertness to the information and knowledge needs of the group.”

Professors Cynthia Kane and Terri Summey developed a presentation about their experiences with embedded librarian assessment for the Kansas Library Association/Missouri Library Association Conference, Kansas City, MO in October 2015. An expanded version was presented at the 17th Distance Library Services Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, in April 2016. In addition, Kane and Summey wrote a chapter about embedded librarian assessment for the 17th Distance Library Services Conference Proceedings (published April 2016).

The presentation and chapter summarized embedded librarian/faculty connections with the ESU departments of Biological Sciences, Counselor Education, Health/Physical Education/Recreation (HPER), Instructional Design and Technology (IDT), Psychology, and the School of Library and Information Management. Specifically, these connections were evaluated through a survey sent to 23 faculty in these disciplines. The survey was conducted electronically via CampusLabs Baseline from October 14-21, 2015. Essentially, we wished to find out if our time spent in embedded initiatives such as librarian physical office hours in campus buildings, virtual office hours, face to face and online library instruction sessions in these faculty’s courses, research consultations with students, and a presence in Canvas courses as a “course librarian” was affecting student learning outcomes in a positive manner.

Part of the survey addressed five of the Association of College and Research Libraries [Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education](#) (2000) and asked faculty on the survey to rate their students’ skill levels from “poor” to “excellent” as a result of working with an embedded librarian. The highest results were:

- Defining and articulating a need for information: 40% of faculty respondents rated this one “very good”
- Accessing needed information effectively and efficiently: 50% of faculty respondents rated this one “very good”
- Evaluating information and its sources critically: 70% of faculty respondents rated this one “very good”
- Using information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose: 50% of faculty respondents rated this one “very good”
- Using information ethically, including demonstrating an awareness of plagiarism and utilizing the appropriate citation style for the discipline: 40% of faculty respondents rated this one “very good”

Plans for 2016/17 include:

- Developing more detailed learning outcomes for discipline-specific information literacy competencies across the ESU undergraduate and graduate curriculums
- Conducting focus groups with not only the faculty who were sent the initial embedded librarianship survey, but also with other faculty in disciplines with whom we have not yet established embedded librarianship initiatives
- Creating and implementing a survey and focus groups of students in courses and disciplines with embedded librarianship in order to:
 - Learn about students' awareness of the embedded librarian program
 - Gather their input on the impact of the program in terms of improving their information literacy competencies
 - Evaluate the students' user experience with embedded librarians
 - Identify ways to modify the program to refine student learning outcomes

AY 2015

3.1. Library personnel collaborate with faculty and others regarding ways to incorporate library collections and services into effective education experiences for students.

3.2. Library personnel collaborate with faculty to embed information literacy learning outcomes into curricula, courses, and assignments.

ULA faculty collaborate with departmental faculty across campus to teach individual information literacy instruction sessions in targeted undergraduate and graduate courses. Much of this instruction takes place face-to-face in the library's Electronic Classroom, Seminar Room, Learning Commons, and other library building venues. Instruction is also held in other classrooms at the Emporia campus and the KC-Metro campus, and virtually via technologies such as Zoom and Skype.

In FY2015, a total of 250 individual instruction sessions were taught and 5,195 students were reached in these sessions. An assessment of Composition information literacy instruction along with sample activities is included in the documentation section of this report.

3.4. Library personnel provide regular instruction in a variety of contexts and employ multiple learning platforms and pedagogies.

In 2014/15, ULA faculty taught UL100, Information Literacy and Technology, a two-credit-hour course that fulfills the "Information Technology" requirement of the ESU General Education Curriculum. The sections and numbers of students enrolled were:

Fall 2014: 8 sections; 86 enrolled students

Spring 2015: 9 sections, 96 enrolled students

ULA continues to experiment with and assess the most effective methods of course delivery for UL100. We offer sections as semester-long face to face instruction, face-to face instruction in the first 8 weeks or second 8 weeks of a semester, and completely online sections. As with the rest of the campus, we switched to Canvas as of Fall 2014 for the university-wide learning management system and employ various aspects of Canvas, particularly discussion threads and the "Speedgrader" of assignments with rubrics, to measure student learning.

Since Fall 2012, ULA faculty have used the IDEA Student Ratings of Teaching in the online form to evaluate our UL100 instruction. We participated in Spring 2015 in the transition of IDEA to IDEACampusLabs, which integrates the online student evaluation forms into a longitudinal study per faculty member of raw and adjusted scores. We are looking forward to the continued utilization of IDEA in this form to gain a more efficient perspective upon our UL100 teaching in terms of overall student learning and effectiveness. Another relatively new approach to information literacy, "embedded librarianship", became a focus for ULA in 2014/15. Two ULA faculty held physical office hours in the departments of HPER, Psychology, and Counselor Education at the ESU campus. Students and departmental faculty visited with these faculty about research assignments and general library questions during the office hours, and also used those hours to make research appointments outside the context of office hours. We plan to review in Summer 2015 the relative success of this embedded librarianship approach in terms of student learning, and expand our outreach to additional departments in 2015/16. We must always keep in mind as well that a number of undergraduate and graduate students, as well as faculty, are not physically on the Emporia campus. The embedded librarianship concept extends to virtual access. ULA faculty have partnered with departmental faculty to create video tutorials about research that are then linked to corresponding Canvas courses.

Attached Files

- [Instruction Statistics 2014 15](#)
- [UL100A Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100B Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100C Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100D Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100E Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100F Posttest Spring 2015](#)

- [UL100G Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100ZA Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100ZB Posttest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100A Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100B Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100C Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100D Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100E Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100F Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100G Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100ZA Pretest Spring 2015](#)
- [UL100ZB Pretest Spring 2015](#)

Program Name : Discovery

Summary of Program Assessments:

4. **Discovery:** Libraries enable users to discover information in all formats through effective use of technology and organization of knowledge.

AY 2018

As noted in the AY 2017 report, ULA collection development has taken a positive approach with the addition of a number of new research databases. In turn, much more emphasis upon metrics has been placed upon the overall usefulness of print and electronic information resources for ESU research and curriculum needs.

The Director of Instruction and Assessment provides usage statistics to the ULA Dean and faculty for each electronic database to which the library subscribes. [COUNTER](#) Code of Practice statistics, which are accepted as standards in the library and information science field, are run for JR1 (COUNTER report for full-text article retrievals in databases offering full text) and PR1 (COUNTER report for total searches, result clicks, and record views by month and database platform). The Director then takes these numbers and calculates costs per full-text retrieval, search, and record view as based upon the subscription cost that year for each database. While not the only method to determine the continued subscriptions to databases, these metrics help to provide insight into the actual use of databases by ESU students and faculty.

In the summer and fall of 2017, the ULA faculty reviewed our print, print+online, and online-only periodical subscriptions from a major vendor, EBSCO. We used the above metrics from the online periodical subscriptions plus our knowledge of academic departments to provide recommendations to the Dean about titles to keep, cancel, or place upon a "probationary" year to keep. From approximately \$130,000 in total EBSCO periodical subscription costs, we cancelled enough titles with low or no use to create around \$28,417.95 in savings and bring our renewal costs to a little over \$100,000. The savings were then utilized to subscribe to additional full-text information databases in order to serve students and faculty more effectively.

The EBSCO periodical subscriptions are currently (as of Summer 2018) being reviewed again by ULA faculty based upon 2018 usage statistics and conversations with academic departments about changing curriculum and research needs. The results will be discussed in the AY 2019 assessment report.

AY 2017

After several years of only adding a few new information databases to our library's collection, toward the end of the Fall 2016 semester we were able to subscribe to a number of new databases targeted to a variety of student and faculty populations. The new resources include:

- Academic Search Complete
- America: History and Life with Full Text
- American Indians Histories and Cultures
- American West
- Arab World Research Source
- Business Source Complete
- CINAHL Complete
- Education Source
- Environment Complete
- Flipster
- Gale Interactive Human Anatomy
- Kanopy
- Library and Information Science Source

- Middle Eastern and Central Asian Studies
- Naxos Music Library: Jazz
- New York Times – Digital Edition
- Points of View Reference Center
- Science and Technology Collection

A number of these resources support specific disciplines and majors, while other resources will greatly help expand our students' and faculty's knowledge of current events nationally and internationally. Examples of the latter include Flipster, which provides digital access to general magazines and trade publications. Quite literally, one "flips" the pages of the periodical online just as they appear in paper form.

The New York Times – Digital Edition offers not only current articles from the New York Times newspaper, but also links to videos and other interactive online content to enhance one's reading experiences.

In terms of assessment, the ULA faculty have been promoting the new databases to various departments and working with other faculty to embed them into courses, assignments, and student learning outcomes. Usage statistics of these databases will be reviewed on a regular basis, with the understanding that these types of statistics are only one data point in an overall consideration of resource integration into the ESU curriculum.

AY 2016

4.4 The library creates and maintains interfaces and system architectures that include all resources and facilitates access from preferred user starting points.

When ESU's Center for Student Involvement implemented #HornetLife, an online student involvement portal, the poster route that distributed paper flyers advertising campus activities was discontinued. As a result, Special Collections and Archives needed to find a way to collect the information that was now only being distributed on #HornetLife's digital bulletin board. For a year we daily identified and printed the flyers that were needed while searching for a better way to collect this information. The Kansas Archive-It Consortium (KAIC) was developed in 2015; this group of Kansas Regents schools purchased a web crawler, Archive-It, which can be strategically targeted to collect digital data from ESU's web pages. So far, we have used it to collect over 98 gigabytes of digital information, including from #HornetLife, the university president's Twitter account, and the Alumni Association. Next steps will include making this information publicly available online via The Internet Archives's Wayback Machine.

AY 2015

4.2. The library integrates library resource access into institutional web and other information portals.

As noted earlier, ESU began using Canvas in the Fall 2014 semester as its learning management system for all courses. Every ESU course has a Canvas "shell" that can be employed as much or as little as a faculty member would like for that individual course and section. There is a "Libraries and Archives" link in each Canvas course that opens a new window to the ULA Webpage. In addition, the ESU Information Technology Department has created a "Course Librarian" role in Canvas. Departmental faculty may request that one or more ULA faculty be embedded in a Canvas course in this role, essentially providing a personal librarian for students in the course to assist with research questions, monitoring a discussion board, searching databases for information, and related library questions.

4.3. The library develops resource guides to provide guidance and multiple points of entry to information.

ULA has subscribed for several years to a system called LibGuides. A product of the SpringShare company, LibGuides are electronic resource guides that can be easily customized for learning support for a discipline, a specific course, or a topical subject such as an upcoming Presidential election or an ESU event/activity. LibGuides was upgraded by SpringShare in early 2015 to version 2.0 and our 137 published guides were migrated to the new interface. As we continue to create and promote LibGuides for classes and subjects, we need to consider ways of measuring and evaluating their contributions to student learning. For example, every "view" for a LibGuide is collected automatically and it is easy in the administrative side to see the most popular guides simply by the number of views. As of 6/12/15, the top ten LibGuides from July 1, 2014 to this date by views are:

Guide Name

- Animal Life History: Searching for Information (843 views)
- HL355 Health Promotion Protection Management (783 views)
- Community Health Assessment for Nursing (724 views)
- Instructional Design and Technology (619 views)
- Composition II 102 (468 views)
- HL850 Disease Topic Project: Disease Presentation and Book Review (395 views)
- HPER Information Literacy Module (300 views)
- Leadership Principles (278 views)

Miller, Stephanie (267 views)

Children's Literature Resources For Use in the Classroom (257 views)

Program Name : Collections

Summary of Program Assessments:

5. **Collections:** Libraries provide access to collections sufficient in quality, depth, diversity, format, and currency to support the research and teaching mission of the institution.

AY 2018

As discussed in the AY 2017 report, the ULA embarked in AY 2018 upon a long-term weeding project of its print materials in order to "right-size" its collection and address more organically the curriculum and research needs of ESU faculty and students.

The following collections as of Summer 2018 have been weeded with extensive feedback solicited from faculty:

- Children's Literature (3rd floor of library)
- Print Reference collection (2nd floor of library)
- Media materials, including DVDs and CDs (2nd floor of library)
- Physical Science print books (decks of library)

To assess the initial selections of items for weeding, ULA faculty have been working with lists that indicate if the materials have ever been checked out since 1999 (the maximum time frame that is currently available in our library system). Materials that have little to no circulation and appear to be dated or irrelevant to present curriculum/research needs are earmarked for potential weeding. The ULA faculty member responsible for a subject area then sends the list of potential weeded titles to faculty in that subject area, with a deadline for feedback. After that deadline has passed and any feedback received, student assistants pull the items and they are withdrawn from the library. The items are offered to the ESU community and the general Emporia community for sale at \$1.00 per item in the library's "Book Nook" on the 1st floor. Remaining materials are then packaged and donated to a non-profit organization that is handled through Better World Books.

One positive result of this physical assessment is a much more active, vital library collection focused specifically upon essential curriculum and research. In addition, the library is making room in the decks and floors for purchases of new material.

Another decision implemented in AY 2018 to improve collections was a gradual switch in the library's call number system. As new materials are purchased and cataloged, they are assigned call numbers in the Library of Congress Classification System (LC). A long-term plan is to convert the entire library collection to LC, but our weeding process needs to be completed first in order for the collection to be truly useful for our patrons. LC is more conducive to academic library organization and research by discipline than that of the current Dewey Decimal System used for decades by our library.

Also related to Collections assessment, the ESU Special Collections and Archives conducted a survey through CampusLabs/Baseline in Fall 2017. The purpose of this survey was to learn more about overall patron awareness of their collections and plans for celebrating the sesquicentennial in 2018 of William Allen White's birth. The survey was deployed to all ESU employees and also through a general URL sent through Hornet Announcements. There were 181 respondents to the survey, with 162 total complete responses. The results of the survey revealed some changes to be made in publicizing the features of Special Collections and Archives to the general ESU audience, along with utilizing other avenues such as social media to advertise events for the William Allen White sesquicentennial.

AY 2017

In 2016/17, ULA personnel began to identify a number of areas in our book and media collections which, for a variety of reasons, appeared to be no longer that relevant to present research and curriculum needs. Some materials had not been checked out in at least 16 years, while others were extremely dated in terms of potentially misleading information.

Mindful of the concerns that can arise with students and faculty when the concept of weeding a library collection is introduced, ULA began in late spring 2017 to take the approach of "right-sizing" its materials. We are carefully and deliberately identifying parts of the collections for potential weeding based upon parameters such as no circulation in at least 15 years, the year of publication, and the considerations of keeping seminal works in the collections. This type of collection assessment is by its very nature long-term and collaborative. We have been able to create lists via our Worldshare Management System (WMS), our library automation system, in which we can review titles of items, call numbers, circulation status, and years of publication. This summer and fall will now be the times for ULA faculty to identify items in a first round for potential weeding and ask for input from other departmental faculty. Finally, ULA faculty will determine the items to be

removed in order to create a living, evolving collection ideally suited to curriculum and research impact.

- The **AY 2016** and **AY 2015** assessments were not directed towards Collections topics. These assessment efforts will occur in the future.

Program Name : Space

Summary of Program Assessments:

6. Space: Libraries are the intellectual commons where users interact with ideas in both physical and virtual environments to expand learning and facilitate the creation of new knowledge.

AY 2018

The ethnographic study of the library that was mentioned in the AY 2017 report was begun in Spring 2018. There are currently three phases to the study, which received IRB approval:

- Phase 1 (completed in Spring 2018): A survey in CampusLabs/Baseline was created and sent to all ESU employees. It also deployed through a general survey link in Hornet Announcements and on iPads at the library's Circulation Desk and Reference Desk. The survey was titled "ESU University Libraries and Archives - Use of Library Building Space Survey". There were 187 respondents and 158 complete responses. The results revealed a range of opinions about the floors and study spaces of the library.
- Phase 2 (completed in Spring 2018): Based upon survey responses, a series of focus groups was conducted with follow-up questions about current and future utilization of library building spaces.
- Phase 3 (to begin Fall 2018): Ethnographic research, including observations of library building space use by patrons and asking patrons to record their choices of spaces for research and study, will take place in order to discover more about patrons' preferences.

All the data will be incorporated into a report for the ULA Dean and other administrators to consider for future building renovations.

AY 2017

The 2016/17 academic year was a period of several physical changes to the William Allen White Library building. The 4th floor of the library was remodeled during Summer and Fall 2016 to expand the Honors College learning spaces, including a classroom for Honors courses and a conference area for Honors students. However, the 4th floor is also a quiet welcoming place for individual and small group study to include all students. The 2nd floor of the library is also undergoing a remodeling project as of May 17, 2017. This floor will be closed in the summer for asbestos abatement, carpet replacement, and additional remodeling.

Headcounts of the 4th floor since its reopening in December 2016 show an increase in student use of this space, along with headcounts of other floors of the library. It is not uncommon on evenings and weekends during the academic year to see all four floors of the library completely filled with students studying or collaborating on projects, and the increased use of the library building prompted extended library hours in Spring 2017 to 3:00 a.m. on the Thursday of Non-Activity Week and Sunday through Thursday of Finals Week.

Taking the lessons of assessment to heart, it is clear that students need a physical space for research well beyond "traditional" library building hours. Based upon the demand for space toward the end of the Spring 2017 semester, ULA is currently exploring an option to open the 1st floor of the library building for 24/7 access during the last three weeks of the Fall 2017 semester. While the library's Learning Commons in the lobby is already open 24/7, student feedback is demonstrating consistently that this area becomes both full and noisy as the semesters draw to a close. If we do try this option for the 1st floor, we will closely monitor security concerns and a gatecount of entrances and exits into the library building for these three weeks in order to determine the future of 24/7 access to the building.

The perceived need for additional student study areas prompts another assessment project for the 2017-18 academic year. While Cremer Hall also offers a 24/7 learning commons space, anecdotal evidence, conversations with students, and general observations reveal overall a general inclination for students to utilize the library building for research and collaboration. The Director of Assessment plans in the next academic year to create and conduct an ethnographic study of the WAW Library building floors, utilizing techniques of student self-reporting, surveys, and focus groups to learn more about our students' physical preferences for study spaces. If possible, we will enlist the assistance of a research methods course in a discipline such as Sociology in order to provide those students with a real-time, practical experience in gathering data through mixed methods.

AY 2016

6.5 The library designs pedagogical spaces to facilitate collaboration and learning, and the creation of new knowledge.

In the fall of 2015, a new space made its debut on the 2nd floor of WAW Library. ACES, the Academic Center for Excellence and Success, is a service that provides free peer tutoring, writing, and research assistance in various disciplines. The center is overseen by Gary Rapp,

ACES Director, and Dr. Shelly Gehrke, Assistant Vice President for Academic Success. The 2nd floor already houses a combined Reference and Circulation Desk, facilitating student research and citation help as well as referrals to ACES tutors. Another project that had been tabled re-emerged in the late spring of 2016 when ULA learned that a budget had been approved by the Provost to begin a complete renovation of the WAW Library's fourth floor. Among other modifications, a larger area for the Honors College will be part of the floor along with an instruction space that can be used for smaller classes or individual teaching sessions. Study carrels to promote an overall quiet floor will also be featured on the floor. Future assessment in the 2016/17 academic year for ULA will include the exploration of partnerships with ACES and the Honors College in their spaces in order to foster collaborations for student learning. In addition, it is possible to monitor "gate counts", electronic tracking of entrances and exits of the library building through counters placed by doors. We presently do not have counters at all the doors, but we can capture certain entrances and exits and look for any usage patterns that may be predicated upon ACES tutoring hours. That is another metric for 2016/17 to report to Gary Rapp and Dr. Shelly Gehrke.

AY 2015

The 2014-2015 assessments were not directed towards Space topics. These assessment efforts will occur in the future.

Program Name : Management/Administration

Summary of Program Assessments:

7. Management/Administration

AY 2018: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2017: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2016

The 2015-2016 assessments were not directed towards Management/Administration topics. These assessment efforts will occur in the future.

AY 2015

7.6. The library plans based upon data and outcomes assessment using a variety of methods both formal and informal. In the Spring 2015 semester, ULA administered a "Faculty Awareness Survey of Libraries and Archives Services and Resources" via the CampusLabs Baseline module. The survey was sent electronically to 382 full-time and part-time faculty at ESU who were classified in a teaching role. 107 faculty responded for a response rate of 28%. The results are being compared this summer to the 2015 ESU Faculty Input Survey in which ULA was also mentioned, as well as the 2010 and 2013 LibQUAL+ Surveys of Library Service Quality administered by ULA to faculty, staff, and students. The comparison will help us identify trends and issues to assist in future planning of services and resources.

Attached Files

[Faculty Awareness Survey Results Spring 2015](#)

Program Name : Personnel

Summary of Program Assessments:

8. Personnel: Libraries provide sufficient number and quality of personnel to ensure excellence and to function successfully in an environment of continuous change.

AY 2018: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

The **AY 2017, AY 2016 and AY 2015** assessments were not directed towards Personnel topics. These assessment efforts will occur in the future.

Program Name : External Relations

Summary of Program Assessments:

9. External Relations: Libraries engage the campus and broader community through multiple strategies in order to advocate, educate, and promote their value.

AY 2018: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2017: This standard was not measured in this academic year.

AY 2016

9.1 The library contributes to external relations through communications, publications, events, and donor cultivation and stewardship.

ULA performs outreach to ESU students on a regular basis by offering activities throughout the academic year. In collaboration with the Office of International Education (OIE), a “game night” in the early fall and early spring is held in the library building, generally from 7:00 to 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. International students host games from their home countries along with other games facilitated by ULA personnel and student assistants, and the students participating in the game night have the opportunity to register for prizes awarded at the end of the evening via drawings. We continually evaluate the overall success of each game night with OIE staff and make adjustments to successive game nights based upon attendance and qualitative feedback from the students.

Additional endeavors to engage the campus and broader community with ULA include activities during National Library Week, an American Library Association initiative generally taking place the second week in April. In April 2016, the National Library Week theme was “Libraries Transform”. Events that week included:

- The launch of a library geocache as a way to introduce people to various resources, services, and unique features of the library building such as the May Masee Office on the 3rd floor;
- Staffing of a table in the Memorial Union to advertise the availability of librarian research assistance;
- “Transform Your Living Space” by planting a flower;
- “Color Your Stress Away” and popcorn in the Learning Commons;
- A ULA Trivia Contest during the week with prize drawings;
- A bulletin board on the library’s 2nd floor for students to post comments about how libraries have transformed them. The comments were collected and will be analyzed this summer to identify any short-term and long-term outcomes in order to improve ULA services and resources.

Overall assessment of the National Library Week events revealed that students respond positively to learning more about library services, to food offerings, and to activities that promise to help with stress management. Similar feedback has been noted for ULA’s hosting of Dead Week and Finals Week events in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016. A tradition in the last few years, for example, is free food (pizza, fruit, punch) in the Learning Commons about 7:00 p.m. on the Sunday evening of Finals Week. One rather unconventional yet useful metric is the number of pizzas consumed in a given time frame. The average on those Sunday evenings is one pizza, 10 slices, per minute. Continued collaboration with the ESU Memorial Union and Sodexo Dining Services resulted in an increase in a monetary donation for food from the Union, from \$500.00 in Fall 2015 to \$800.00 in Spring 2016. Other successful activities during Dead Week and Finals Week continue to be “Color Your Stress Away” and “Make Your Own Stress Ball”. One lesson learned this spring in terms of engaging students is the need to revive an extraordinarily popular event we have hosted in past year. Animals such as therapy dogs for stress relief are extremely well-attended activities in academic libraries during midterms and finals weeks. Students who live in residence halls or apartments where pets are not permitted deeply appreciate the opportunity to spend some time with trained therapy animals. ULA in conjunction with the Sociology Club has hosted “Dogs in the Library” in the 2014/15 academic year and the participation from students was very enthusiastic. Due to time commitments of the Sociology Club and its faculty advisor and other circumstances, ULA was only able to bring in one dog in Fall 2015 and none in Spring 2016. However, personnel at the Reference Desk and in other venues fielded a number of questions from students asking “When will the dogs be back?” This summer is an excellent time for ULA faculty and staff to begin planning for future events and consider both formal and informal assessments of outreach to which students respond best. Special Collections and Archives regularly does educational programming with grade schools and college classes, so expanding to include high school classes was next. Special Collections and Archives staff and a graduate assistant developed several educational options that could meet a range of needs in various programs, then discussed possible teacher connections with Emporia High School librarian Carmaine Ternes. The decision was made to approach art faculty and Josh Pavlik accepted the invitation to incorporate the Curator for a Day program into his class curriculum. With the Curator for a Day program, students were able to access surrogates of art pieces from the May Masee Collection and create miniature exhibitions based on a theme of their own choosing. We presented the students with information about how art exhibits are created, from the selection of pieces to the creation of labels and the implementation of the exhibition. Working with these students allowed the Special Collections and Archives personnel to educate them about the materials within the May Masee Collection and the Special Collections and Archives at Emporia State University. As this was a brand new program, we implemented assessment that asked about the likes and dislikes of the program, elements of the program that the students learned, and what could be related to other classes. The data suggested that the students, while they enjoyed the program overall, needed to have the information presented to them in a slightly different manner, so we will modify how the program is presented to the students.

AY 2015

9.1. The library contributes to external relations through communications, publications, events, and donor cultivation and stewardship. Announcements about ULA activities and events are regularly communicated on Buzz-In, the ULA Webpage via a “slideshow” of photos and images, and through the social media outlets of ULA’s Facebook and Twitter accounts. In Fall 2014 and Spring 2015, ULA partnered with the Memorial Union and Sodexo to host a number of activities for students during Dead Week and Finals Week. In addition, ULA worked with the Sociology Club in these semesters to sponsor a highly successful “Dogs in the Library” event. Students had opportunities to

come to the library building and spend some quality time with well behaved dogs, encouraging stress relief and relaxation. National Library Week in April 2015 brought another opportunity to coordinate with campus and community organizations for events ranging from a Game Night to a "Night with Notable Authors", featuring local authors of Kansas Notable Books. In terms of donor relations, the University Archives benefited this spring from a bequest from the estate of Dr. Carol Marshall. The funds will go toward supporting research in the Special Collections and Archives for African-American history in Emporia and at ESU. We will evaluate the feedback from Dead Week and Finals Week activities as well as National Library Week this summer to learn more about our successes with external relations, and methods to strengthen those relationships in 2015/16.

Progress: Ongoing over Multiple Years

Feedback on Assessments:

Academic Year 2018

The focus of this past year's assessment practices, Educational Role, Discovery, Collections, and Space has resulted in marked improvements in providing both instruction and the utility of the library and affiliated resources for the campus community. The curriculum change for the UL100 course from 2- to 3-credit hours is going to greatly enhance the student learning experience in information literacy and information technology. Updating and expanding the curriculum for the UL100 course along with the additional instruction time should result in better student learning experiences related to Information Literacy. The spring 2018 results from the National Survey of Student Engagement topical module on information literacy can serve as a benchmark, as the next survey iteration will be in 2020. This two-year span should provide enough time for the affects of the curricular change to emerge in the data. The comparisons of the survey items from the two survey administrations may be useful as an indicator of the change in student perceptions of their learning experiences related to information literacy. Also, the change from the SAILS to the TATIL Pilot Project will provide some new assessment data to analyze student learning and to inform change strategies. The data from these two assessment methods combined with the robust course-embedded assessment results, should provide a productive data set to inform change strategies to improve the student learning experience.

The COUNTER usage data metrics being studied for the EBSCO databases is a highly productive way of using assessment data to inform decisions. For example, leveraging usage metrics to identify the underutilized databases, and then reinvesting the funds from efficiencies to expand offerings, is a best practice in using assessment data to improve learning support. Rightsizing the print materials collection and concurrently navigating the change from the Dewey Decimal System to the Library of Congress Classification System is the right thing to do, although assessing what to retain and what to remove is always a hard task. The processes that you describe in navigating these changes and how you are assessing your directional movements is serving the ULA well. Although it may not receive the glamor of some assessment practices, assessing how the campus community will perceive these changes and taking into consideration the feedback from the constituents is the way to go. This also transcends to ways in which you are assessing the space utilization in the library physical spaces. The assessment practices you have been employing since 2015 have been instrumental in all the ways in which you have moved the ULA forward. There have been so many positive changes in the past few years and these transitions are all so well thought out and planned. Your assessment practices have definitely informed these changes in positive and productive ways. Keep up the exceptional work!!!

Academic Year 2017

The University Libraries and Archives unit uses assessment to drive strategic decisions. The 2017 academic year has been defined by many positive strategic changes to improve the learning environment, enhance and improve information availability and refinement of the information literacy curriculum. The ULA professionals have been working diligently to collaborate across the institution to create a transformative learning environment in the WAW Library. Implementing assessment strategies and efforts in the Educational Role, Discovery, Collections, and Space contexts have been very well coordinated and are closely aligned with the dedicated work which has been occurring to improve the quality, breadth, relevancy, and capacity for student learning experiences.

Educational Role

The continuous improvement of student learning outcomes and expectations of Information Literacy are both timely and equally important. Students abilities to develop skills necessary to access information, refine information searches, analyze and synthesize information to make new knowledge, understand professional contexts of research and scholarly written expression, and learn ethical and respectful use of information are critical to success in life, career, and lifelong learning. The UL100 focus on continuous improvement of information literacy serves a key niche in the university's general education curriculum. The piloting of the Threshold Achievement Test of Information Literacy evidences the dedication to ensuring that the teachings of the UL100 course align with the expectations of the external environment. It will be interesting to learn how these pilot assessment findings present.

Discovery: The enhancements and increased availability of electronic database resources have greatly changed the learning landscape at the university. The use of assessment and seeking information and feedback from the university community has served the ULA well. These changes have been very refreshing for the campus community and have vastly enhanced the access to learning materials and have extended

the ways to connect with information and knowledge.

Collections: In respect to assessment and having to make some tough decisions, this area of focused improvement appears to be the most challenging. Your assessment efforts have proven very effective in providing information for informed decision-making. The notion of having to change space utilization or to transition physical information to another is always contentious, however the use of assessment practices to properly vet the need for change and to identify exactly what that change should be is critical. Let assessment serve as the change agent for these tough choices, it will lead you in the right direction with data to present to stakeholders to show how your decisions were informed. A win-win situation in a tough decision-making set of circumstances.

Space:

The vision for this space is electrifying, providing students and faculty with a state-of-the-art learning environment that embraces a variety of technological experiences. This is truly a hallmark of the forward thinking learning that has always been a part of Emporia State University.

The continuous improvements in the WAW Library evidence the newest advances in student learning that keep ESU on the forefront offering learning spaces and collaborative areas to incubate learning at its finest. Yes, this is the 4th floor of the WAW Library a highly interactive learning center that has used assessment in many capacities to inform positive change!

Keep up the prioritizing of your assessment efforts, this strategy has served the ULA well and should continue to be a great tool in navigating change.

Academic Year 2016

The University Libraries and Archives serves a key role in the success of the University community. The diversity of operations and the collaborations which occur both in the library setting and across multiple disciplines within the campus community are extensive. The assessment process that is outlined and narrated in this assessment plan template evidences the extent to which the ULA impacts the successes of all. The library faculty teach courses in information literacy and have collaborated together in synthesizing common learning outcomes, and have participated in the ACRL-Project Sails externally normed standardized instrument. The faculty have taken this process one step further and developed a unique section as a part of the instrument refinement. The data on student learning is bench-marked and compared across multiple terms. This information serves to inform changes in curriculum, delivery, and pedagogy. These excellent assessment techniques are serving the faculty well, and in addition, there are current efforts toward aligning course-embedded assessments using the AAC&U Value Rubric. The faculty have adapted well as there have been ongoing changes occurring at the professional association levels in regard to student learning outcomes and broad overarching learning goals. The faculty are encouraged to stay steadfast in their improvement endeavors, as experts in the discipline, it through this expertise that refinements to student learning outcomes are best actualized. Remain in this continuous quality improvement mode and make adaptations as suited to meet student learning needs. As changes emerge at the professional association level, the faculty can decide how best to navigate these changes and in deciding what is important for students to know and be able to do. Keep in mind that faculty in the field who are teaching the knowledge and skills can actually be ahead of professional organizational change. Keep up the good work in assessing UL100.

The assessment of the lifelong learning concept of embedded Librarianship is an example of multiple-faceted assessment planning which includes the assessment of student learning, measurement of faculty perspectives and expectations of student learning. This is a fine assessment design that is employed across disciplines as it relates to ULA outreach efforts. The development of the measurement instrument to collect data, the professional presentation, and finally, the published chapter on behalf of the assessment work is commendable, so kudos to ULA faculty Kane and Summey for their fabulous work. The upcoming year's plan to involve faculty in developing a greater outreach to a larger number of disciplines will serve the students well in learning about and developing information literacy skills. Finally, the collaborations between the ULA and ACES and the Honors College is unprecedented. The enhancements and expansion of the physical space in the WAW Library combined with the additional programming and services to assist students in their academic endeavors will positively impact student success and satisfaction, and provide an exceptional learning experience. The assessment plan in place will serve to inform changes as the physical space, services, and programming evolve. The ULA is in for an exciting year as new leadership will provide many opportunities to change and new ideas to share. I'll look forward to reading what you have accomplished at the end of May! Keep up the great assessment work!

AY 2015

The assessment plan is well aligned using both the University's strategic plan and also the ALA guidelines. The institutional effectiveness piece where the plan's structure and timing of assessments being guided by the future designation as a "standard or open Pathways" and by accreditation expectations is well thought out. It is beneficial to plan accordingly, so that assessment cycles can be completed as required as well as providing evidence for continuous quality improvement. The breadth and depth at which you pursue assessments is impressive. The University Libraries and Archives as an educational entity serves many roles and many constituents in a variety of settings and approaches. The physical spaces and the technology resources will continue to be challenges and the

approach you are taking to inventory usage and demand will do a lot for keeping current and ahead of the curve. It is very important to continue to acknowledge every context in which you are supporting the success of students, faculty, departments, programs, and the university. You really do have an extended hand in all that occurs at the university and technology has really allowed for the extension of these educational endeavors. Your approach to assessing the AL Information Literacy and Technology course is valuable. I looked over the data from the pre-post tests and I would have liked to see some reflection and dialogue about how the data from these tests was used to inform curricular change? If it was present, I must have missed it. In the 21st century, information literacy is and will continue to play a prominent role in the education and success of our students.

The outreach that is happening with departments and programs in locations away from the library is benefitting the institution at many levels. Keeping track of these services and the curriculum being covered in workshops and presentations will most likely change over time. You may want to begin with some indirect perspective of how individuals perceive the value of these services, and in the future come up with some way inform curricular change for what is being provided. Also, take advantage of measuring student learning (value added) for those direct learning experiences you are providing. Those programs with defined learning outcomes. You don't have to measure everything, every time, but keep a list of what and when you will assess the direct learning. For the management/administration area the faculty survey was a great idea. Keeping a pulse on what faculty need and expect is directly related to how they integrate their teaching and research into the educational environment. Two additional resources available are the Senior Survey and the NSSE survey. There are questions on the Senior Survey that directly ask students about their perceptions of library services, you may consider including findings in your future reports. The university also administers the National Survey of Student Engagement every other year and there are questions asking about library services as well. These two indirect measures are both an external and internal look at students perceptions. These data won't define your unit, but can provide some different insights to look at how you are meeting the needs of the students. Your creativeness and proactive approach to educating students and the campus community are great assets. The changes to the facilities made over the past two years and those that are in the works show great promise to new opportunities to expand how you affect learning on campus. Your staff and management are professional, comprehensive, and resourceful. The campus community benefits from your endeavors. Your assessment plan is solid and ambitious. You offer so much and extend your resources in wonderful ways. You may reach the point where you need to be selective in what you are assessing and rotate some of the assessments on two to three year cycles, especially those things you are doing really well. As you approach assessment always consider what types of data you need to inform what you do and in what ways can you directly assess student learning? Direct assessment toward those things that you feel are opportunities for change and improvement. All of us have time constraints, so identifying priorities for assessment may need to play into the future as time may be a limitation. Sustaining the existing program may become challenging.

Providing Department: University Libraries and Archives

Responsible Roles: Michelle Hammond (e11098557), Cynthia Kane (E10088226)