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| **DEGREE PROGRAM**  **STUDENT LEARNING REPORT**  (Rev. August 2013) | **ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY**  **Department of Applied Technology**  **For Academic Year 2012-2013** |

Effectively assessing a degree program should address a number of factors:

1. Valid student learning outcomes should be clearly articulated;
2. Valid assessment measures should be used, consistent with the standards of professional practice;
3. There should be evidence that assessment data are being used by faculty to make necessary instructional or assessment changes; and

there should be evidence that instructional or assessment changes are being implemented to improve student learning.

**Relationship of Degree Program (or Major) Learning Outcomes to Departmental and University Missions**

|  |
| --- |
| **Name of Degree, including Level and Major: BT in Applied Technology** |

1. **A.**  Insert and clearly state the school, department and degree program missions in the spaces below.

| **University Mission** | **School Mission** | **Department Mission** | **Degree Program Mission** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities. | The mission of the School of Business and Technology is to prepare students to compete and perform successfully in diverse careers in business, technology, sport management, and related fields by providing a quality academic experience. Undergraduate programs and their respective curricula will remain responsive to social, economic, and technical developments. | The mission of the Department of Applied Technology is to support the School of Business and Technology and RSU in their mission to prepare students to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities. Specifically, the organizational structure of the Department of Technology provides the technology course support for the Associate in Science and Associate in Applied Science degrees, as well as the Bachelor of Science in Business Information Technology, the Bachelor of Science in Game Development, and the Bachelor of Technology in Applied Technology. As indicated, many of the programs offered by the Department of Applied Technology are available online. | The Bachelor of Technology in Applied Technology is designed to provide educational opportunities for individuals who possess an Associate in Applied Science degree or equivalent and need additional education in order to perform job requirements or to advance their professional careers. |

**B.**  Insert and clearly state school purposes, department purposes and degree program student learning outcomes in the spaces below, making sure to align the degree program student learning outcomes with their appropriate school and department purposes, and these outcomes and purposes with their appropriate university commitments.

| **University Commitments** | **School Purposes** | **Department Purposes** | **Student Learning Outcomes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking. | The SBT provides this support by offering two-year and four-year educational opportunities in business, sport management, and technology. | To provide the technology course support for the AS in Computer Science and AAS in Applied Technology degrees as well as BS in Business Information Technology, BS in Game Development, and BT in Applied Technology. | Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of business and technology concepts, terminology and applications in current business environments.  Students will demonstrate an understanding of management principles  Students will demonstrate an understanding of marketing principles.  Students will demonstrate an understanding of how to manage risk in current and future business environments. |
| To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning. | The associate and baccalaureate degrees are taught using a large  array of innovative methods, including regular classes, online  courses, and compressed video. |  |  |
| To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic program sand prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society. | To prepare students to compete and perform successfully in diverse careers in business, technology, sport management, and related fields by providing a quality academic experience. |  |  |
| To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs. |  |  |  |
| To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs. |  |  |  |
| To support and strengthen student, faculty and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution. |  |  |  |
| To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual and personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves. |  |  |  |

**Discussion of Instructional Changes Resulting from 2011-2012 Degree Program Student Learning Report**

1. List and discuss all instructional or assessment changes proposed in Part 5 of last year’s Degree Program Student Learning Report, whether implemented or not. Any other changes or assessment activities from last year, but not mentioned in last year’s report, should be discussed here as well. Emphasis should be placed on student learning and considerations such as course improvements, the assessment process, and the budget. If no changes were planned or implemented, simply state “No changes were planned or implemented.”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional or Assessment Changes** | **Changes Implemented (Y/N)** | **Impact of Changes on Degree Program Curriculum or Budget** |
| BTAT curriculum was revised. We added the Renewable Energy Management Systems Option and added and removed some of the core courses in the Applied Technology Option. | Y | Only minor changes in the Applied Technology Option. Notably Accounting I, Enterprise Resource Management Systems, Information Assurance and Regulations were added; Data Communications and Organizational Behavior were removed. No impact on budget. |

1. The University Assessment Committee in its Degree Program Peer Review Report provided feedback and recommendations for improvement in assessment. List or accurately summarize all feedback and recommendations from the committee, and state whether they were implemented or will be implemented at a future date. If they were not or will not be implemented, please explain why. If no changes were recommended last year, simply state “No changes were recommended.”

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Feedback and Recommended Changes from the University Assessment Committee** | **Suggestions Implemented**  **(Y/N)** | **Changes that Were or Will Be Implemented, or**  **Rationale for Changes that Were Not Implemented** |
| Page 1. Section 1(A). The School Mission statement is not in accord with the one that appears in the Bulletin. | Y | It is now copied from the current Bulletin. |
| Page 2. Section 1(B). Only one University Commitment is addressed by the School Purposes? The School of Liberal Arts is aligned with five and the School of Mathematics, Sciences and Health Science is aligned with four. | Y | There are now three alignments. |
| The department did not mention any planned changes in last year’s Student Learning Report. However, several changes did occur. This often happens when unanticipated changes occur after the Student Learning Report (SLR) is completed. Those changes, whether planned or not, should be reported in Section Two of the next year’s SLR.  Page 2. Section 2. One of those changes was reported in Section Two: *Organizational Behavior* (MGMT 3303) will no longer be assessed.  Page 4 Item 2. Another change was not reported in Section Two, but was reported in Section Three. This change involved adding a new option, Renewable Energy Management. It was also mentioned that “some of the core courses” would be added or removed. None of the course changes were described. | N | Section 2 and Section 3 are a bit confusing. It seems that when one reports in Section 3, then this same item should be reported in Section 2 of the following year’s report as well. The Renewable Energy Option was approved during 2011-2012 and implemented in the fall of 2012. So, it should be correct to place this change in Section 3 rather than Section 2 of the 2011-2012 report.  The change of curriculum was reported in Section 2 of this report which covers 2012-2013, the year of implementation.  Again, this is reported in Section 2 of this report, which we feel correct in terms of the time period of the report. |
| Pages 3-6. Section 3. Yes. This does not mean that the department and the peer reviewers agreed on everything, but it does mean that the department addressed all observations and suggestions made by the peer review team. |  | Agree. |
| Page 6. Section 4(A). SLO #1 is overly broad. The outcome “competence” needs to be more specifically defined. What does the department want the student to know or demonstrate? Oral, written and technology based communication represent three outcomes. | Y | This SLO was modified in this report. In our opinion the word “competent” should be acceptable as Degree Program Outcomes (last year’s report heading) as long as it is specified in the Assessment Measures and Performance Standards. |
| Page 6. Section 4(B).Too little information is given about the measures for the peer reviewers to make a judgment about whether they are appropriate. Much of the information provided about the performance standard of SLO #1 is actually describing the outcome’s assessment measure and would be better included in col. B rather than col. C. | N | Since we changed the SLO, we feel Column B reflects the assessment measure. It would be impractical to list the objectives of all core courses. |
| Page 6. Section 4(C). No. 1. Regarding the performance standard for SLO #1, does the department mean to say that students will demonstrate their knowledge of the concepts cited as major objectives in the syllabi of the degree program’s core courses? If so, this is a good description of the measure. All that needs to be stated for the performance standard is “80% of the students will score ≥ 70%.”  Page 7 Section 4(C). No. 2. Page 8 Section 4 (C). No. 3. As stated last year, the peer reviewers urge the department to set a minimum standard of knowledge for MGMT 3013 and MKTG 3113, and use the scores on the post-test as measures of its attainment. Otherwise, the department is only measuring improvement, rather than overall knowledge. Finally, we do not understand why the department is setting a pre-test benchmark (80%) since it is a standard for a course that has not yet been taken. | Y  N | Yes. Wording was changed to reflect the reviewer’s suggestion in this report.  We are not sure the difference between measuring improvement and overall knowledge. We think they are synonymous. An 80% bench mark for pre-test may indicate that the expectation of students achieving the goal is quite small. For some courses, students with working experience may score very well in the pre-test. |
| Page 7. Section 4(D). The sampling method for SLO #2 is to include all students who take MGMT 3013 and MKTG 3113. regardless whether they are BT-AT majors. As we stated last year, we do not understand why the scores of the majors cannot be segregated from those on non-majors. | N | There are two problems. One is that the Business Department will not break down the data; the other, the class roster uses the designation “Applied Technology” for both AAS and BTAT majors. MGMT 3013 is required in both programs. We will contact ACS to see if two distinguished major names be displayed in class rosters. |
| Yes. |  | N/A |
| Page 6. Section 4(F). SLO #1 states that none of the scores were satisfactory, but in the next column (G) the department states that all students met the measure of ≥ 70%. We suggest that distribution of scores be reported and that at three years of data be included; this will provide more than a single year’s results and perhaps enable more substantive conclusions.  Page 6. Section 4(F). SLO #2 regarding MGMT 3013 states that the difference between pre-test average (51%) and post-test average (82%) represents a 31% improvement. Doesn’t it represent of difference of 31 percentage points, which reflects an 62% improvement? Likewise, regarding MKTG 3113, doesn’t an improvement of 22 percentage points reflect a 74% improvement? Also, as we suggested above regarding SLO #1, it would be helpful if the distribution of scores could be reported for several years.  Pages 7-8. Section 4(F). SLO #3. We are confused about why a standard is associated with pre-test scores. The department reported that 35 of 42 student improved by ≥ 20% or achieved 80% on the pre-test. No breakdown between the two is reported. | Y  N  N | The distribution of scores was presented in this report.  We may consider using Applied Technology courses to replace these two business courses for assessment next year. We will have more control over the assessment activities and be able to comply with the committee’s suggestions.  The data were obtained from the Business Department. Our understanding is that they aggregate the numbers. No breakdown between pre-test and post-test were reported. |
| Pages 6-8. Section (G). The conclusions should provide more information than can obviously be drawn from the results. A brief substantive discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of student performance should be included here. However, nothing more was provided than could be gleaned from looking at the results. | Y | We tried to explain the conclusion of SLO#1 in more detail. The rest needs to be worked on. |
| Yes. |  | N/A |
| In the absence of anything being included, the instructions requested the department write, “No changes are planned.” However, this section was left blank.  What the peer reviewers stated last year holds true this year, too. “It is the opinion of the reviewers that all departments are continually making important improvements in their approach to assessment, instruction, and student learning, and these are usually worth of being reported.” | Y | Expected changes were described in this report. |
| In the absence of anything being included, the instructions requested the department write “none.” However, this section was left blank. | Y | So noted. We will put “none or N/A” rather than leave it blank. |
| There are no indirect assessment measures, which was also the case last year. The department stated there were two direct measures, but the peer reviewers counted four—one each for TECH 4504, MGMT 3013, MKTG 3113, and TECH 3203. | Y | MGMT 3013 and MKTG 3113 were counted as one since they were under the same SLO. We separated these two in this report. |
| Eight faculty are listed in the Bulletin as being members of the department. Three are listed has having participated in the Student Learning Report. | N | Others were not involved in assessment activities of this program. |

**Analysis of Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes**

1. For all student learning outcomes (as listed in Part 1 B above), describe the assessment measures and performance standards used, as well as the sampling methods and sample sizes. For each measure, document the results of the activity measured and draw any relevant conclusions related to strengths and weaknesses of their performance.

| **A.**  **Student Learning Outcomes** | **B.**  **Assessment Measures** | **C.**  **Performance Standards** | **D.**  **Sampling Methods** | **E.**  **Sample Size**  **(N)** | **F.**  **Results** | **G.**  **Conclusions** | **H.**  **Performance Standards Met**  **(Y/N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Students will demonstrate comprehensive knowledge of business and technology concepts, terminology and applications in current business environments. | A standardized BTAT Exit Exam which covers the concepts cited in the major objectives of the various courses in the program. | 80% of the students will score ≥ 70%. | All BTAT students enrolled in TECH 4504 Capstone | 13  (Fall-5; Spring 8) | Student Percent  1 (Fall) 53  2 (Fall) 67  3 (Fall) 57  4 (Fall) 56  5 (Fall) 56  6 (Spring) 51  7 (Spring) 71  8 (Spring) 68  9 (Spring) 56  10 (Spring) 46  11 (Spring) 69  12 (Spring) 59  13 (Spring) 64  Average 59.5  1 out of 13, which is 7.7%, scored 70% or better. | Student did not do well. Questions are specific to each subject area and it may be difficult for them to recall specifics of the courses that they may have taken few semesters ago. We noted a couple questions with incorrect answers. This exam needs to be reviewed and updated by the respective faculty who teach the core courses. | N |
| 2. Students will demonstrate an understanding of management principles | A pre-test and post-test will be given in  MGMT 3013. | 70% of students will improve post-test scores over pre-test scores by at least 20% or score at the 80% or above level on the pre-test. | All students taking MGMT 3013 | 92 | Pre-test average was 51.0 and the post-test average was 82.3. This gives 61.4% improvement of the post-test over the pre-test. | Since individual improvements data are not given, the conclusion is hypothetical. However, assuming the improvement distribution is close to a normal distribution, it is highly likely that the performance measure has been met. | Y |
| 3. Students will demonstrate an understanding of marketing principles. | A pre-test and post-test will be given in  MKTG 3113. | 70% of students will improve post-test scores over pre-test scores by at least 20% or score at the 80% or above level on the pre-test. | All students in MKTG 3113 classes | 83 | Pre-test average was 62.7 and the post-test average was 84.6. This gives 34.9% improvement of the post-test over the pre-test. | Since individual improvements data are not given, the conclusion is hypothetical. However, assuming the improvement distribution is close to a normal distribution, it is highly likely that the performance measure has been met. | Y |
| 4. Students will demonstrate an understanding of how to manage risk in current and future business environments. | A pre-test and post-test will be given in TECH 3203 Intro to Risk Management | Seventy percent of students will improve post-test scores over pre-test scores by at least 20% in the course TECH 3203 Introduction to Risk Management or score at the 80% or above level on the pre-test. | All BTAT students taking TECH 3203 Intro to Risk Management | 33 | 33 students who took both the pre- and post-test. Of that number, 27 either improved by 20%--post-test over pre-test--or made 80% or above on the pre-test. That is 81.81% of the students who took both the pre- and post-test. | Students demonstrated an understanding of how to manage risk in current and future business environments. | Y |

1. State any proposed instructional or assessment changes to be implemented for the next academic year. They should be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 (above) or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum, degree plan, assessment process, or budget. If no changes are planned, simply state “No changes are planned.”

| **Student Learning Outcomes** | **Instructional or Assessment Changes** | **Rationale for Changes** | **Impact of Planned Changes on Student Learning and Other Considerations.** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Outcome 1 | Review and update the content of the exit exam. | The curriculum has changed and some of the questions in the exam are no longer applicable. | The results of the exam would be closer reflection of student knowledge of core courses in the program. |
| 2. Replace Outcomes #2 and #3 with IT, CS, or TECH course outcomes where our department will have control over the assessing activities and data collection. | To be discussed at departmental meetings in the spring of 2014 and implement in the 2014 spring semester. | Data are aggregated and do not show the performance of BTAT majors alone. | No impact on student learning or budget. |

1. (OPTIONAL) If your department or an individual faculty member has developed a teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom, please share it below. Examples can be seen at <http://www.rsu.edu/committees/assessment/docs/FacultyInsights.pdf> . Please briefly describe the instructional practice. More detail can be communicated during the face to face peer review session. The Peer Review Report does not rate this part, but it does note whether or not any contribution has been made.

| **Description** |
| --- |
| No notable examples. |

1. Assessment Measures:
2. How many different assessment measures were used? 2
3. List the direct measures (see rubric): exit exam, pre- and post test
4. List the indirect measures (see rubric): none

**Documentation of Faculty Assessment**

1. **A.** How many full time faculty (regardless of department affiliation) teach in the program? 4

**B.** Provide the names and signatures of all faculty members who contributed to this report and indicate their respective roles:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Faculty Members** | Roles in the Assessment Process  (e.g., collect data, analyze data, prepare report, review report, etc.) | **Signatures** |
| Roy Gardner | Prepare report | On separate sheet |
| Lois Ann O’Neal | Data collection and analysis of TECH 3203 | On separate sheet |
| Curtis Sparling | Data collection and analysis of TECH 4504 | On separate sheet |
| Bert Tollison | Provided data for MGMT3013 and MKTG3113 | On separate sheet |

1. Reviewed by:

| **Titles** | **Names** | **Signatures** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Department Head | Roy Gardner | On separate sheet | 12/9/2013 |
| Dean | Bruce Garrison | On separate sheet | 12/9/2013 |

|  |
| --- |
| **RUBRIC FOR STUDENT LEARNING STUDENT LEARNING REPORT** |

1. **A. Are the school, department and program missions clearly stated?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| The program, department, and school missions are clearly stated. | The program, department, and school missions are stated, yet exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief). | The program, department, and school missions are incomplete and exhibit some deficiency (e.g., are partial or brief). | The program, department, and school missions are not stated. |

1. **Are student learning outcomes and department purposes aligned with university commitments and school purposes?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Student learning outcomes and department purposes are aligned with university commitments and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate some alignment with university commitments and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes demonstrate limited alignment with university commitment and school purposes. | Student learning outcomes and department purposes do not demonstrate alignment with university commitment and school purposes. |

1. **How well did the department incorporate instructional or assessment changes from last year’s report or from other assessment activities?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All planned changes were listed, whether they were implemented or not, and their impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed thoroughly. | Most planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was discussed. | Some planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not clearly discussed. | No planned changes were listed, and their status or impact on curriculum or program budget was not discussed. |

1. **Did the department include peer review feedback and provide rationale for implementing or not implementing suggestions?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All reviewer feedback was listed, and for each suggestion a clear rationale was given for its being implemented or not. | Most reviewer feedback was listed, and for most suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not. | Some reviewer feedback was listed, and for some suggestions a rationale was given for their being implemented or not. | Feedback from reviewers was not included. |

1. **A. Are the student learning outcomes listed and measurable?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy). | Most student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy). | Some student learning outcomes are listed and measurable in student behavioral action verbs (e.g., Bloom’s Taxonomy). | Student learning outcomes are either not listed or not measurable. |

1. **Are the assessment measures appropriate for the student learning outcomes?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Allassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | Mostassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | Someassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. | None of theassessment measures are appropriate to the student learning outcomes. |

1. **Do the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | Most performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | Some of the performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. | No performance standards provide a clearly defined threshold at an acceptable level of student performance. |

1. **Is the sampling method appropriate for all assessment measures?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| The sampling methodology is appropriate for all assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for most assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for some assessment measures. | The sampling methodology is appropriate for none of the assessment measures. |

1. **Is the sample size listed for each assessment measure?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Sample size was listed for all assessment measures. | Sample size was listed for most assessment measures. | Sample size was listed for some assessment measures. | Sample size was not listed for any assessment measures. |

1. **How well do the data provide clear and meaningful overview of the results?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| For all student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For most student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For some student learning outcomes the results were clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. | For none of the student learning outcomes were the results clear, more than a single year’s results were included, and meaningful information was given that reveals an overview of student performance. |

1. **Are the conclusions reasonably drawn and significantly related to student learning** **outcomes?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | Most conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | Some conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results and related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. | No conclusions are reasonably drawn and significantly based on the results or related to the strengths and weaknesses in student performance. |

1. **Does the report indicate whether the performance standards were met?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Stated for all performance standards. | Stated for most performance standards. | Stated for some performance standards. | Not stated for any performance standard. |

1. **How well supported is the rationale for making assessment or instructional changes? The justification can be based on conclusions reported in Part 4 or on informal activities, such as faculty meetings and discussions, conferences, pilot projects, textbook adoption, new course proposals, curriculum modifications, etc. Explain the rationale for these changes and how they will impact student learning and other considerations, such as curriculum degree plan, assessment process, or budget.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| All planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is well grounded and convincingly explained. | Most planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is mostly well grounded and convincingly explained. | Some planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. The rationale for planned changes is lacking or is not convincingly explained. | No planned changes are specifically focused on student learning and based on the conclusions. There is no rationale. |

1. **Did the faculty include at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yes** | **No** |  |  |
| The faculty has included at least one teaching technique they believe improves student learning or student engagement in the classroom. | The faculty has not included any teaching techniques they believe improve student learning or student engagement in the classroom. |  |  |

1. **How well did the faculty vary the assessment measures?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| Assessment measures vary and include multiple direct measures and at least one indirect measure. The number of measures is consistent with those listed. | Assessment measures vary, but they are all direct. The number of measures is consistent with those listed. | Assessment measures do not vary or are all indirect. There is some inconsistency in the number of measures recorded and the total listed. | Assessment measures are not all listed or are listed in the wrong category. The total number of measures is not consistent with those listed. |

1. **Does the list of faculty participants indicate a majority of those teaching in the program and clearly describe their role in the assessment process?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4 = Exemplary** | **3 = Established** | **2 = Developing** | **1 = Undeveloped** |
| The faculty role is clearly identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the process. The roles are varied. | The faculty role is identified and it is apparent that the majority of the faculty participated in the process. The roles are not varied. | The faculty roles are not identified. Few faculty participated. | The faculty roles are not identified. Faculty participation is not sufficiently described to make a determination about who participated. |

**DIRECT EVIDENCE of student learning is tangible, visible, self-explanatory evidence of exactly what students have and haven’t learned. Examples include:**

**EXPLANATION & EXAMPLES OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT EVIDENCE OF LEARNING**

1. Ratings of student skills by their field experience supervisors.
2. Scores and pass rates on licensure/certification exams or other published tests (e.g. Major Field Tests) that assess key learning outcomes.
3. Capstone experiences such as research projects, presentations, oral defenses, exhibitions, or performances that are scored using a rubric.
4. Written work or performances scored using a rubric.
5. Portfolios of student work.
6. Scores on locally-designed tests such as final examinations in key courses, qualifying examinations, and comprehensive examinations that are accompanied by test blueprints describing what the tests assess.
7. Score gains between entry and exit on published or local tests or writing samples.
8. Employer ratings of the skills of recent graduates.
9. Summaries and analyses of electronic class discussion threads.
10. Student reflections on their values, attitudes, and beliefs, if developing those are intended outcomes of the program.

**INDIRECT EVIDENCE provides signs that students are probably learning, but the evidence of exactly what they are leaning is less clear and less convincing. Examples include:**

1. Course grades.
2. Assignment grades, if not accompanied by a rubric or scoring guide.
3. For four year programs, admission rates into graduate programs and graduation rates from those programs.
4. For two year programs, admission rates into four-year institutions and graduation rates from those programs.
5. Placement rates of graduates into appropriate career positions and starting salaries.
6. Alumni perceptions of their career responsibilities and satisfaction.
7. Student ratings of their knowledge and skills and reflections on what they have learning over the course of the program.
8. Those questions on end-of-course student evaluations forms that ask about the course rather than the instructor.
9. Student/alumni satisfaction with their learning, collected through surveys, exit interviews, or focus groups
10. Honors, awards, and scholarships earned by students and alumni.

Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide*. Anker Publishing Company: Bolton, MA

These examples “Discussion of Instructional Changes” in Part 2 of the Student Learning Report illustrate how an instructional or assessment change, even though not listed or discussed in the previous year’s Student Learning Report, was nevertheless included in the current year’s report. Important changes cannot always be anticipated, yet they are significant and should not be left out of the report.