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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: BS in Game Development** |

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. | To provide students with the highest possible quality education in the areas of game development and general education |

**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 be able to utilize current professional 2-D and 3-D software to produce high-quality virtual worlds for animated games.  Students will demonstrate skill in creating large scale computer graphics programs. |
| 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. |  | Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve the degree program. |
| 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 the student with a bachelor-level education focused on preparing the student to gain employment in the technology field or continue his/her graduate education. | Students will demonstrate their proficiency in programming. |
| 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** |
| Changed outcome 1.  MFT Computer Science exam was administered.  Survey revised  CS 3633 shift languages from C++ to Java (2012 report incorrectly reported the change in CS3733). | Y  Y  N  Y | None  None  None  Teaching of C++ for GD will be moved to CS 3733 |

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 | School mission statement was updated. |
| 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.  Page 2. Section 1(B). The Degree Program Outcome (“Students will create and implement computer environments providing a large-scale immersive game experience.”) does not seem to align with the University Mission (“To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safely that is supportive of teaching and learning.”).  Pages 1-2. Section 1(B). The first Degree Program Outcome (“To provide the student with a bachelor-level education focused on preparing the student to gain employment in the game development field or continue his/her graduate education.”) is not an outcome; rather, it would be more appropriately included as a Department Purpose. A Degree Program Outcome (or student learning outcome) is a “brief, clear statement that describes the desired learning outcome of instruction, that is, the specific skills, values, and attitudes students should exhibit that reflect broader goals.” | Y  Y  Y | The school purposes were brought into alignment with the university commitments with three purposes.  The item was moved and aligned with the first university mission statement “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 wording of the outcome was also modified to reflect inclusion of other graphical programming applications.  The item was revised and moved to the Department Purpose |
| Page 2. Section 2. The peer reviewers are not able to evaluate instructional or assessment changes made in the past year because the department did not report any.  Page 4. Section 4(C). The performance standard was changed from 2010-2011 SLR (70% of students will complete 3D project at 70% accuracy) to a new standard in the current report (100% of students will complete 3D project at 86% accuracy. This change should have been included in Section 2, but was not. | Y | The changes this year was reported. |
| Pages 3-4. Section 3. The instructions for Section 3 state, “List or accurately summarize all feedback and recommendations from the committee . . .” This was not done. | Y | It has been done this year. |
| Page 5. Section 4(A). The third degree program outcome is not a program outcome. It is a measurement and should be listed in Section 4(B) under Assessment Measures. This was brought to the department’s attention by last year’s peer reviewers and included in the Peer Review Report. | Y | It has been revised this year. |
| Yes. |  |  |
| Page 5. Section 4(C). The performance standards increased dramatically for the first degree program outcome from last year to this? They went from 70%/70% to 100%/86%. This should have been explained in Section 2, but there was no explanation. |  |  |
| Yes. |  |  |
| Yes. |  |  |
| Page 4. Section 4(F). Regarding the first outcome, the department states that the students “completed their final projects.” It is not clear is this means they met the performance standard.  Page 5. Section 4(F). Regarding the second outcome, the results state that varying proportions of students scored “over 70%.” In the future, would the department needs to provide more detailed distribution data.  Page 5. Section 4(F). Regarding the third outcome, since the measure included a “series of questions,” it would be more revealing if the department could provide information about responses to questions in addition to the one about program satisfaction. | Y | More details on the assessment of senior projects are provided in this year’s report. |
| Yes. |  |  |
| Yes. |  |  |
| Pages 5-6. Section 5. Regarding the new approach to the student survey, it is not clear if the department is thinking about surveying students about individual courses.  Page 6. Section 5. The new outcome (“Students will demonstrate their proficiency in programming”) and its field test major, along with the switch from C++ to Java, sound like excellent ideas. |  | The survey did include questions about individual courses |
| No. |  |  |
| They are in line with the rubrics’ standard for exemplary. |  |  |

**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 be able to utilize current professional 2-D and 3-D software to produce high-quality virtual worlds for animated games | In CS 3733, students will complete a large 3D software project requiring the use of the industry standard OpenGL API.  This project will be evaluated by the instructor. | In CS 3733 100% of the BS GD students will be able to complete a large 3D project with an accuracy of 86%. | All GD taking CS 3733. | 0 | CS 3733 was not offered due to low enrollment. | None | N |
| 2. Students will demonstrate skill in creating large scale computer graphics programs. | CHANGE: In the Capstone (CS4504) Students will complete their Senior Game Project which will be evaluated by the general public. | 75% of the projects would be rated at an overall score of 75% approval using a Likert survey. Questions were on 1) Creativity, 2) Artwork, 3) Controls & Movement, 4) Puzzles, 5) Overall Enjoyment | 19 Students in computer programming courses (CS 2323, CS 3363, SP3950) and GD alumni downloaded the student’s game and were surveyed. | 1 | Using Poor=1, Fair=2, Average=3, Good=4 and Excellent=5  Creativity 3.1, std 1.2  Artwork 2.4, std 1.1  Controls 2.7 std 1.0  Puzzles 2.3 std 1.2  Overall 2.4 std 1.2 | The game could not be considered a success as only 30% surveyed would recommend it to their friends. In no category was the 75% approval achieved. | N |
| 3. Students will demonstrate their proficiency in programming. | The ETS Major Field Test in Computer Science will be given to all students enrolled in the Capstone CS4504. | 50% of the students will score at the 25 percentile level. | All GD students in CS4504 | 1 | The sole student enrolled in CS 4504 scored 134 on a range of 120-1200. His percentile rank was 15. | Clearly the result was poor but with a single data point and a new criteria it is not possible to draw any firm conclusions. | N |
| 4. Students will express their satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) with, and offer suggestions on how to improve the degree program. | Survey will be rewritten and given to all GD students. |  | All GD students in CS4504 | 0 | Because the survey of a single student could not be offered anonymously, it was not conducted. |  | N |

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. Students will be able to utilize current professional 2-D and 3-D software to produce high-quality virtual worlds for animated games | New assessment criteria will be developed and evaluated in a different new course. | Curriculum modifications have added courses and altered the course sequences. |  |
| 2. Students will demonstrate skill in creating large scale computer graphics programs. | Multiple surveys of the students projects will be conducted throughout CS 4504. | More extensive play testing would help identify weaknesses and allow time for correction in the large final project. | More rapid feedback on works in progress should improve the overall scores. |

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** |
| --- |
|  |

1. Assessment Measures:
2. How many different assessment measures were used? 4
3. List the direct measures (see rubric): Standardized test, programming assignments and projects
4. List the indirect measures (see rubric): Survey

**Documentation of Faculty Assessment**

1. **A.** How many full time faculty (regardless of department affiliation) teach in the program? 8

**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** |
| Peter Macpherson | Collected data, analyze data, prepare report | 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.