


EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT
(Chief Academic Officer)

MSC 3445
New Mexico State University
P.O. Box 30001
Las Cruces, NM 88003-8001
Telephone: (505) 646-2127



October 20, 1999

TO: Academic Deans
Department Heads

FROM: John Owens 

SUBJECT: Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

This year we are requesting a current assessment plan for both undergraduate and graduate programs, if applicable, as well as a progress report on the implementation of these plans to assess student learning outcomes in your department/college during 1998-99. During last year's review, it became obvious that outcomes assessment plans had been or were in the process of being revised by a number of departments and that the plans we had on file frequently did not represent departments' current assessment programs.

We continue to work toward the goal of having all departments actively assessing student learning and using the results of their assessment activities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (referred to as "Stage 3"). Outcomes Assessment Committee I (Academic Achievement/Student Learning) would like to emphasize its expectation that each department at each level of instruction have some direct measure of student learning. As OAC I stated in its summary of institutional progress last spring, "student attitudes, student satisfaction, employability and acceptance into graduate school may be indicators of success which are helpful to the department and to program review, but they are not measures of student learning." Enclosure A provides illustrations of direct measures of student learning used by departments in their assessment programs. In addition, the committee is convinced, based on past departmental experiences, that voluntary assessment activities do not provide a useful measure of student learning.

We are enclosing OAC I's institutional summary of departmental outcomes assessment activities for 1997-98, which you received last May (Enclosure B). The purpose of such a summary is to provide feedback to departments and colleges as they continue refining and using the results of their assessment activities. Each department also received the department-specific comments which came out of last year's review of departmental assessment reports by OAC I.

Each departmental report on student outcomes assessment should address the following topics as clearly and directly as possible:

1. A current copy of your outcomes assessment plan. The plan should address both undergraduate and graduate programs for which the department is responsible.
2. An outline of each program's assessment activities in 1998-99 within the context of your outcomes assessment plan. While NMSU encourages multiple measures for assessing student learning, both direct and indirect, please identify specifically the direct measures you are using to assess student learning.
3. A description of what you have learned from these assessment activities, especially from the results of your direct measures of student learning. Has this information led to changes in your program? How will you use this information in your short-term and long-term program planning?
4. A description of any changes you anticipate in your outcomes assessment activities as a result of your past year's assessment experience or the latest OAC I evaluation of your assessment program.
5. A description of how you communicate the results of outcomes assessment to all faculty in your department.

NMSU has a separate assessment program for the general education curriculum as a whole. Thus, the reporting on outcomes assessment in the major, outlined above, need not address departmental efforts related to the assessment of general education.

If you have any questions, please contact the OAC I member (see Enclosure C) from your college or discipline area. If your department would like assistance from the committee as it considers additions or revisions to its outcomes assessment plan or develops additional measures of student learning, please contact your committee member or OAC I chairman, Don Lindsey at 646-3210.

All departmental reports should be submitted to the appropriate dean's office, each of which should forward a college package to me by Friday, December 10, 1999.

Enclosures

cc: Vice President Juan Franco
Members of OAC I

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IN THE MAJOR

What is student outcomes assessment in the major? When we speak of the assessment of student learning/academic achievement, we are talking about assessment beyond the individual course. Outcomes assessment in the major is intended to assess the integration of student learning across courses in the degree program. Thus, the combined departmental faculty, not the individual faculty member, is responsible for determining the intended learning outcomes of a degree program and for assessing the extent to which program graduates are achieving those intended learning outcomes.

How should we measure student learning outcomes? Departmental assessment activities should provide information useful to departmental faculty in improving the instructional program and increasing student learning. To provide a more complete and reliable picture of student learning in the major, NMSU encourages departments to use multiple measures of assessment for each program, at least one of which should be a direct measure of student learning.

What are direct measures of student learning? Direct measures of student learning include comprehensive examinations, such as professional/graduate school admissions tests, licensure examinations, standardized achievement tests, and locally developed tests reflecting the intended student outcomes of the department.

Direct measures of student learning also include other techniques which require students to integrate and apply the knowledge gained from the range of courses in a degree program. These may include assessing student performance and cognitive development through capstone courses, student academic portfolios, theses or culminating research projects, structured interviews with panels of faculty, and structured evaluations of internship experiences.

Direct measures also may assess student behavioral and attitudinal change, if specific behaviors and attitudes are a part of the intended student outcomes identified by the departmental faculty.


COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS

Office of the Associate Dean and Director of Academic Programs
Box 30003, Dept. 3AG
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003-0003
(505) 646-1807



May 6, 1999

TO: Executive Vice President John C. Owens

FROM: Don Lindsey, Chair 
Outcomes Assessment Committee I

SUBJECT: 1998-99 NMSU Summary Report of Outcomes Assessment in the Major

In response to your memo of 1-28-99 requesting academic departments to submit a progress report on assessment of student learning outcomes in the major during the previous year, all departments, except one, submitted a summary of their outcomes assessment program. Upon receipt of these departmental reports, Outcomes Assessment Committee I (Academic Achievement/Student Learning) conducted its annual review of NMSU's progress in assessment in the major at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

The purpose of this OAC I review is to provide both an institutional view of our progress in the assessment of student academic achievement and to provide collegial and, we hope, useful feedback to departments and colleges as they continue to refine and use the results of their assessment activities. Thus, the committee determines whether departments are engaged in direct measures to assess student learning and assigns a ranking to each department at both the undergraduate and graduate level, as appropriate. The rankings indicate whether the department is: 0 - not assessing learning, 1 - planning for assessment of learning, 2 - implementing assessment of learning, or 3 - using the results of student learning assessment measures. Enclosed with this memo is a tabular summary of OAC I's evaluation of the current assessment program for each academic department at NMSU, based on this year's departmental assessment reports. We are still working on a compilation of the department-specific comments which came out of the OAC I team reviews of departmental assessment reports. These will be distributed to you, the Academic and Associate Deans and the appropriate departments as soon as they are completed.

As you know, the North Central evaluation team report last year was very complimentary of NMSU's efforts in student learning assessment in the major. The NCA team report, however, noted that "not all departments have successfully implemented assessment measures" and that we must still "reach the departments that are engaging in marginal efforts and . . . move the other departments to make continuing quality improvements in instruction and curriculum."

With the recommendations of the North Central team in mind, OAC I has completed its evaluation of each department's current assessment program. The level of rigor in reviewing and commenting on the individual departmental reports has not changed. However, more detail in the summary provides a clearer picture of actual assessment status. For example, in previous years, if a department had any assessment activity that directly measured student learning at either the undergraduate or graduate level, the summary said "Yes" under "Assessing Learning," though often the measurement of student learning was not happening at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. This year we have made clear in the summary whether student learning, not satisfaction or opinions about the program, is being measured at each program level.

Given the late request for the assessment report this year, we tried to minimize the work required by departments. We have concluded, however, that the "short-form" response option did not work well. Often the information provided was too sketchy to determine whether student learning was being assessed or what ranking best described the "stage" of the assessment activities of the department. Graduate programs often did not mention theses or comprehensive orals, which may be requirements of their programs and can be excellent measures of student learning. We could not assume the use of these measures if they were not addressed in the reports.

In addition, a number of departments were going through transitions this year—of personnel, curriculum or assessment plans. We anticipate next year's reports to reflect some of these changes through revised assessment plans, more meaningful measures of learning and more useful assessment results. Our rankings in some cases reflect a new beginning for the department's assessment program. If the department is not assessing learning now, it received a "No." Since the stages of implementation relate only to assessment of learning, the appropriate stage for a "No" is "0." If, however, a "No" is accompanied by a 1 or a 2, it means the department is currently in the process of either planning or implementing a direct assessment of student learning. We hope that departments at this stage of development can all progress to level 3 (using results of LOA) by next year.

The OAC I committee would like to summarize in this report a few key issues which arise over and over in the review team comments on the individual departmental assessment reports. Hopefully these comments will be useful to departments as they plan for their assessment activities in the coming year.

- A. While NMSU encourages departments to seek information on student achievement through multiple assessment measures, we expect each department at each level of instruction to have some direct measure of student learning, based on the goals for the program.
- B. Student attitudes, student satisfaction, employability and acceptance into graduate school may be indicators of success which are helpful to the department and to program review, but they are not measures of student learning.

- C. Voluntary assessment activities, as most departments that used them conceded, are relatively useless in providing a meaningful and generalizable measure of student learning.
- D. Some departments have submitted new assessment plans or have indicated their plans are being revised. Other departments are reporting on assessment programs that vary significantly from the assessment plans we have on file. We think it is time (next year) to request that all departments submit their current assessment plans for both undergraduate and graduate programs and that their assessment status reports address their progress in implementing their plans.

In summary, we agree with our North Central review team that NMSU's process of assessing student academic achievement is now imbedded in the ongoing work of the university. As the university-wide committee charged with oversight and support of assessment in the major, OAC I continues to encourage all departments as they refine and fully implement their outcomes assessment plans. All academic programs can benefit from the information resulting from a rigorous and direct assessment of student learning at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Enclosure

xc: J. Franco, Vice President for Administration
Academic Deans and Associate Deans
OAC I Members

SUMMARY

Status of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment in the Major in 1998-99 By Department Within College (Reviewed in Spring 2000)

Code for Stage:

- no program at this level
- 0 no learning outcomes assessment (LOA) reported
or committee cannot determine
- 1 planning for LOA
- 2 implementing LOA
- 3 using results of LOA

College of Agriculture and Home Economics

DEPT	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	Assessing Learning	Stage	Assessing Learning	Stage
AGE	Yes	3	Yes	2
AGHT	Yes	3	Yes	3
ANSC	Yes	3	Yes	0
AXED	Yes	3	Yes	3
EPWS	Yes	3	Yes	2
FCSC	No	1	No	1
HRTM	Yes	3	-	-
WLSC	Yes	2	Yes	2

College of Arts and Sciences

DEPT	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	Assessing Learning	Stage	Assessing Learning	Stage
AS	Yes	0	-	-
AERO	Yes	3	-	-
ART	Yes	2	Yes	2
ASTR	-	-	Yes	3

SUMMARY

Status of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment in the Major in 1998-99 By Department Within College (Reviewed in Spring 2000)

DEPT	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	Assessing Learning	Stage	Assessing Learning	Stage
BIOL	No	2	Yes	3
BIS	Yes	2	-	-
C J	Yes	3	Yes	3
C S	Yes	0	Yes	2
CHEM	No	0	No	0
COMM	Yes	3	Yes	3
ENGL	Yes	3	Yes	3
GEOG	Yes	2	Yes	2
GEOL	Yes	3	Yes	3
GOVT	Yes	3	Yes	3
HIST	Yes	3	Yes	2
HON	Yes	2	-	-
JOUR	Yes	2	-	-
L L	No	0	No	0
M SC	No	0	-	-
MATH	No	1	Yes	2
MUS	Yes	2	Yes	2
PHIL	Yes	3	-	-
PHYS	Yes	3	Yes	3
PSY	Yes	2	Yes	2
SOC	Soc - No	2	Yes	3
	Anthro - Yes	3		
THTR	Yes	3	-	-
W S	Yes	1	-	-

SUMMARY

Status of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment in the Major in 1998-99
By Department Within College
(Reviewed in Spring 2000)

College of Business Administration and Economics

DEPT	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	Assessing Learning	Stage	Assessing Learning	Stage
ACCT/BCS	Yes	2	Yes	2
ECON	Yes	3	Yes	3
FIN	Yes	2	-	-
MGT	Yes	2	-	-
MKTG	Yes	2	-	-
MBA	-	-	Yes	2

College of Education

DEPT	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	Assessing Learning	Stage	Assessing Learning	Stage
CI	Yes	2	Yes	2
CEP	-	-	Yes	3
EMD	-	-	Yes	3
PE	Yes	3	-	-
SECD	Yes	3	Yes	3

SUMMARY

Status of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment in the Major in 1998-99
By Department Within College
(Reviewed in Spring 2000)

College of Engineering

DEPT	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	Assessing Learning	Stage	Assessing Learning	Stage
CAGE	Yes	3	Yes	2
CHE	Yes	3	No report submitted	
EE	No	0	No	1
ET	Yes	3	-	-
IE	Yes	2	Yes	2
ME	Yes	3	Yes	3
SUR	Yes	3	-	-

College of Health and Social Services

DEPT	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE	
	Assessing Learning	Stage	Assessing Learning	Stage
HL S	Yes	3	Yes	3
NURS	Yes	3	Yes	2
S WK	Yes	3	Yes	3

Department *ACCT*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Direct assessment using standardized national exam, with plans for benchmarking in Accounting and BCS. Survey of graduating seniors and alumni.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Very strong and serious design with good future potential. The plans are substantially revised and will take several years to implement but there should be good payoff. Plan shows serious commitment to ambitious plan with well founded goals and good methods.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Business realistically assesses its current stage.

General Comment: Good work. Difficult to assess, however, because one report tries to cover the whole college, with BA, MBA and Ph.D.

Department *ACCT*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Direct assessment using standardized national exam, plus specific economics exam for those majors, with plans for benchmarking in Accounting and BCS. Survey of graduating seniors and alumni.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Very strong and serious design with good future potential. The plans are substantially revised and will take several years to implement but there should be good payoff. Plan shows serious commitment to ambitious plan with well founded goals and good methods.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Business realistically assesses its current stage.

General Comment: Good work. Difficult to assess, however, because one report tries to cover the whole college, with BA, MBA and Ph.D.

Department **AERO**

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Activities to demonstrate skills.
Student feedback.
Student performance in national activities.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: We are giving some benefit of the doubt and it would be helpful to
have more detail about learning outcomes measurements.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: While the measurements are vague there is clear use of information
gained.

Department

AG E

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Senior Project.
Exit interview with department head.
Alumni survey.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Senior project includes research, writing, and presentation skills to support subject matter knowledge. The main issue is whether this project will adequately demonstrate the range of learning within the program. The department is sensitive to this issue and is also considering a standardized subject matter test. A direct assessment should be seriously considered.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Good work.

General Comment:

Department is undertaking innovative curricular redesign around core competencies, to be demonstrated in senior project. Very good linkage of assessment to curriculum, with keen awareness of best educational practices.

Department

AG E

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Exit interviews

Alumni survey

Research projects and presentations

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Little detail in report

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning

Stage Comment:

No mention of use of results.

General Comment:

Department

AGHT

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Direct measurement: Capstone courses.

Indirect measurement: Internship

Alumni survey

Graduating student survey

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

No statistics are given regarding the success of students in capstone courses.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Using results.

General Comments:

Although the plan is included, it is presented in fragmented form and should be written as a separate, whole document.

Department *ANSC*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Outcome assessment centers on capstone experiences (courses) and Undergraduate Academic Quadrathlon.

Indirect method-Employer feedback on students.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Assessing student learning but still emphasize student satisfaction. Using information for revision of curriculum.

General Comments: Need to submit outcome assessment document.

Do all seniors participate in Academic Quadrathlon?

Department *ANSC*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Assessment measures not given.
What are goals and mentoring roles of faculty?

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Final orals and written final exams are direct measures but not
mentioned in report.

Stage Description: Cannot determine.

Stage Comment: Indicate changes are being made reflecting changing needs of the
market and not changes to improve or evaluate student learning.

General Comment: Need to submit outcome assessment document with assessment
measures.

Department *ART*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: GPA, completion of research paper, successful entry to graduate programs, exhibition with critique from professor.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Problems of reliability arise, since individual professors assess/critique the work of their own students, both on the written papers and the exhibition. Shared standards and independent evaluation using two or more faculty would greatly increase the reliability of the assessments.

Reliance on a research paper will give some evidence of writing and research ability in a particular subject in art history, but will not present any portrait of overall knowledge and skill. There is no apparent measure of overall learning in the art history BA.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Implementing, but not clearly using results. Do not plan any changes and the report is full of resistant posturing.

No data is presented on successful entry to graduate programs and no data is offered on what happens to students who do not go on to graduate school.

General Comment: It is unfortunate that Art does not think more creatively about outcomes assessment, since they are well positioned to have innovative and useful measures. The use of studio performance on a constant basis and a culminating exhibition represent strong foundational practices. Only a bit of creative thinking would turn existing practice into model assessment. The department is rejecting the idea of outcomes assessment based on preconceptions of what the university expects, rather than figuring out what is appropriate to Art.

Department *ART*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Reviews of work each semester, GPA, completion of research paper, course distribution requirements, thesis, exhibition or presentation with critique from professor.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Reliance is primarily on traditional graduate school practices, with faculty committees assessing work. There is an exit evaluation, though students are not completing it.

The reviews of student work each semester by three professors appears to be a good feature. But it is not clear how these reviews are used or what changes they might trigger in practices.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Implementing traditional practices, but not clearly using results.

No data is presented on what happens to students who graduate.

General Comment: Outcomes assessment does not appear to be welcomed by this department.

Department AS

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Pop quizzes, writing, questionnaires, interviews, surveys, MCAT Exam.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: AS100, AS102 and AS300 use direct measurement. AS301 and AS305 use indirect measurement.

Stage Description: Cannot determine.

Stage Comment: Cannot tell if the results are being used.

General Comments: Do we really need to evaluate?

Department *AXED*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Self assessment, employer assessments of competencies, written papers and oral presentations, philosophy statements internship.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Many measures are indirect but the direct ones involve self or employer assessment. We assume the competency checklist is rated by faculty.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Limited use but more in planning.

Department

AXED

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Article critique, proposal evaluation, also competencies checklists.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Both measures come from one class AXED 556 and both seem limited in scope to research methodology issues. Seems as though the comprehensive oral exam could be included.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Although using the results, there appears to be more to AXED than just research methods. Seems that the scope needs to be broadened.

General Comment:

Limited scope leans in the direction of inadequate. Report repeats the information.

Department

BIOL

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

1993 plan submitted – not being used.
Revised plan being used – never submitted or misplaced.
Description of plan being used - exit interviews.
Portfolio evaluation - not successful.
December 1999 draft of new plan.

Learning Assessment?

No

Assessment Comment:

Present system - no.

In new plan, standardized exam will be administered to Biology 111G students (entry course) and Biology 467.

Standardized exit exam will assess graduating senior's perception of scientific and biological issues.

Question the relevance of comparing freshman and senior mean scores.

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Not using results at this time.

General Comment:

Draft plan – includes good assessment methods.

Department

BIS

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Arts & Sciences core requirements, portfolio, written assessment by advisor, written/oral examination.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Widely diverse program with simple but adequate direct measures.

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Relatively low numbers of students so need to develop individualized learning goals for each student.

General Comment:

Planning appears good but needs more work.

Department *CI*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: The report covers all areas at a high level of generality. There are many assessment measures, including teaching portfolios, questionnaires, exams, employment data, national teacher exams, observation and videotaping of student teaching, practica courses, student research projects and teaching material development, student teaching observation and evaluation.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: This department uses a wide range of evaluation measures with an emphasis on student performance and evaluation.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Measures assess individual student performance, but not necessarily program outcomes.

General Comment: It is not clear how all multiple measures used in the various programs at various degree levels constitute a useful overall outcomes assessment. Students are evaluated in many ways and have many educational experiences in the field as well as classroom. Other than overall performance on the national exam (data not reported), however, it is not clear that all these activities lead to any integrated perspective on how well the programs are doing, what they need to change, or what their successes and failures are.

Department

CI

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

The report covers all areas at a high level of generality. There are many assessment measures, including teaching portfolios, questionnaires, exams, employment data, national teacher exams, observation and videotaping of student teaching, practica courses, student research projects and teaching material development, student teaching observation and evaluation.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

This department uses a wide range of evaluation measures with an emphasis on student performance and evaluation.

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Measures assess individual student performance, but not necessarily program outcomes.

General Comment:

It is not clear how all the multiple measures used in the various degree levels constitute a useful overall outcomes assessment. Students are evaluated in many ways and have many educational experiences in the field as well as classroom. Other than overall performance on the national exam (data not reported), however, it is not clear that all these activities lead to any integrated perspective on how well the programs are doing, what they need to change, or what their successes and failures are.

Department *C J*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Employer interviews
 Internship reports
 Standardized test
 Exit interviews

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Standardized tests are available but not necessarily given to all students. Internship reports may also measure learning.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Department

C J

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Oral exam
Thesis
Oral exam at defense
Exit survey
Dean's rep report

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Department *C S*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Interviews between a professor and the graduating senior, feedback requests from alumni in newsletter.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Appears quite weak -- does interview evaluate program or student learning?

Stage Description: Cannot determine stage.

Stage Comment:

General Comment: Focus and results unclear.

Department *C S*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: GRE subject exam, MA oral exam, research papers in 500-level courses, feedback requests from alumni in newsletter.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Cannot determine if results are being used.

General Comment: The department is concentrating on gathering and disseminating information via the internet, which is a good development and can lead to useful changes in practice.

Department

CAGE

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Real world projects in several courses evaluated by faculty and practicing engineers, senior standardized exam, ABET accreditation, exit interviews, surveys of alumni and employers.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Strong design.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

No results are reported, but the process appears to be well in place and well designed.

General Comment:

Good work.

Department *CAGE*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Publication of thesis and dissertation work, defense.

Learning Assessment? Yes, in traditional graduate program fashion.

It is not clear that there are exit interviews or surveys of alumni and employers targeting graduate programs.

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Cannot determine whether results are being used.

Department **CHEM**

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Indirect methods: Alumni tracking
Exit interviews

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: There is not sufficient information in the report to identify the direct methods they may currently be using. From last years report it appears that they were at one time using direct methods.

Stage Description: Cannot determine.

Stage Comment:

General Comment: There are no statistics given to allow a quantitative evaluation of their outcomes assessment results.

Department

CHEM

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Indirect methods: Alumni tracking
Exit interviews

Learning Assessment?

No

Assessment Comment:

There is not sufficient information in the report to identify the direct methods they may currently be using. From last years report it appears that they were at one time using direct methods.

Stage Description:

Cannot determine.

Stage Comment:

General Comment:

There are no statistics given to allow a quantitative evaluation of their outcomes assessment results.

Department

COMM

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Student papers

Portfolios

Senior exit interviews - indirect method

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

No change in curriculum considered at this time.

General Comment:

Outcomes indicate faculty need to place greater emphasis on critical analysis of communication events.

Department

COMM

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Two-hour final exam

Faculty fills out an outcome assessment checklist on each student

Non-thesis students must pass an eight-hour written comprehensive exam

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

No change in program. Change being recommended in assessment process.

General Comment:

Outcomes indicate faculty need to place greater emphasis on critical analysis of communication events.

Department *E E*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Records check, class grades, student surveys, alumni surveys.

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: Records check, student surveys don't directly measure student learning. Class grades measure student learning at the completion of a class, but not cumulative learning at the end of a degree program.

Recommend consultation with Outcomes Assessment Committee I to develop a useful assessment program.

Stage Description: Not assessing learning

Stage Comment: The results of the alumni survey provide good indirect feedback as to the attractiveness of the program and perceptions of learning.

General Comment: Examples of direct measures of student learning are:
Professional exams
Required exit exams
Capstone design classes with adequate assessment of student skills

Department *EE*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Under development.

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: Recommend the EE Department seek consultation from Outcomes Assessment Committee I regarding the development of an outcomes assessment program.

Stage Description: Planning for assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

General Comment: Examples of direct learning assessment at the graduate level include:
Master's written or oral
Ph.D. comprehensive exam
Analysis of the above results in a fashion that provides
feedback to the department.

Department *E T*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Written and oral exams, placement, surveys, portfolio assessment, senior exam and senior capstone project but no detail.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Good skill lists. Many assessment measures spoken of in future tense.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Because of the ABET accreditation, implementation of some assessment measures has been delayed.

General Comment: Good start on the planning but regressed a bit from last year.

Department *ECON*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Direct methods: ETS majors exam (will be implemented SP2000)
 National exam is given to seniors
 Exit essay exam

 Indirect methods: Student survey
 Alumni survey

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Major revisions were made last year to outcomes assessment
 procedures and additional changes will be implemented this year.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: No information provided as to how outcomes assessment information
 is shared with faculty members.

General Comment: Although outcomes assessment plan is included, it is in fragmented
 form. An outcomes assessment plan should be submitted that is a
 single document describing outcomes assessment for the graduate and
 undergraduate programs in the department.

Department *EMD*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Copy of college outcomes assessment process, but plan not provided.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Indicate they use final oral exam. Please provide all information requested next year.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Five proposed changes listed. Adding written comps for masters. State that written comprehensive exams for master's in higher education administration is being developed.

Department *ENGL*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Exit interviews, writing samples.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Analysis of writing samples is an excellent measure of direct learning outcomes for English. Were samples from all students? Results not noted.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Good job of results use.

General Comment: Should formalize the analysis of the writing samples.

Department

ENGL

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Culminating projects, colloquium rating, written and oral exams, dissertation, graduate placement.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Well standardized measurements. Appreciate the planning for placement analysis using web.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

A report of results and recommendation was included.

General Comment:

On track – looks like English has taken this exercise seriously and it's helping.

Department

EPWS

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Senior interviews
Employer interviews
Capstone course/senior seminar
Regional competition (selected students)

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Capstone and senior seminars may provide assessment but no mention of how learning outcomes are assessed by "the collective faculty." Specifics are needed. The competition is good but limited to only a few students.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Report needs to more clearly define outcomes assessment measurement in capstone and senior seminar courses.

Department *EPWS*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Thesis

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Little detail provided in the report.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: No mention of use of results.

Department *FCSC*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Irrelevant: Department is planning complete revamp beginning SP2000.

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: (Some direct measures are part of ongoing program requirements -dietetic and education.)

Stage Description: Planning for assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Honest recognition that previous activities were insufficient.

General Comment: Good to see honest admission of past problems and willingness to engage in constructive planning in the coming year. Should plan for learning assessment and student performance. The plans as described tend not to be direct measures of learning.

Department

FCSC

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Irrelevant: Department is planning complete revamp beginning SP2000.

Learning Assessment?

No

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Planning for assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Honest recognition that previous activities were insufficient.

General Comment:

Good to see honest admission of past problems and willingness to engage in constructive planning in the coming year. Should plan for learning assessment and student performance. The plans as described tend not to be direct measures of learning.

Department *FIN*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: No assessment plan for Finance itself.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Use evaluation of courses by students and undergraduate student survey. Both of these are indirect measures.

Stage Description: Implementing college-wide.

Stage Comment: Cannot tell what is happening in department.

Department

GEOG

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Pre and post testing, interview, research paper.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Report indicates numbers too small to use.

Department **GEOG**

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Oral exams, public presentation

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Somewhat unclear report.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Very few students.

Department **GEOL**

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Developed own local subject exam to be completed in capstone course, accompanied by short survey.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: No clear trends on results from departmental exam - difficult to see how the results will lead to changes. Appear to have only about two graduates/year, making it difficult to rely on means.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures, but with limited success.

Stage Comment: The department is making changes (increasing attention to writing, adding specialized courses, including more field work) that seem like good changes but that do not seem a direct consequence of assessment.

General Comment: Department should continue to refine efforts and link results to action.

Department **GEOL**

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Reliance on thesis, colloquium, and defense, along with a survey of grad students and alumni. Uses a rating scale for thesis and defense evaluation.

Learning Assessment? Yes, though conventional practice.

Assessment Comment: No clear trends on results from department exam – difficult to see how the results will lead to changes. Appear to have only about two graduates/year, making it difficult to rely on means.

Difficult to discern any trends or make generalizations from results of graduate assessment.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment, but with limited success.

Stage Comment: The department is making changes (increasing attention to writing, adding specialized courses, including more field work) that seem like good changes but that do not seem a direct consequence of assessment.

General Comment: Department should continue to refine efforts and link results to action.

Department

GOVT

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Standardized test that measures fundamental knowledge in six areas.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

New assessment method focusing on government participation will be developed in the Spring 2000 semester.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

General Comment:

Student evaluations are a measure of student feelings regarding the professor and course taught and are not really measure of student learning.

Department *HIST*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Two-part exit exam – essay and chronological exam
Portfolio

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Results indicate weakness in freshman student knowledge in area of
chronology. Chronology has been emphasized in lectures and tests
with success.

Department *HIST*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Final oral exams

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Oral exams – thesis track.

Written public history project report - Public History track.

One faculty member on each MA committee will grade student performance in areas of bibliography, chronology, area of knowledge and theory using a 1-5 scale.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: No specific use of results stated, or how they are being used.

Department *HL S*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Supervisor rating for internships
Oral final exams

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Oral final exams – however the feedback mechanism on performance
on this exam to improve the educational process is not clear.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Final exam requirements clarified. Field experience requirement
clarified.

Department *HON*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Survey, course/program evaluation, symposium participation, senior thesis

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Students graduating with University Honors are required to do a thesis but no detail is provided about how it will be used in outcomes assessment.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Waiting for the GEAC report for further assessment planning.

General Comment: Probably could do more with outcomes assessment.

Department

HRTM

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Direct methods: Capstone courses/projects

Indirect methods: Student and alumni surveys

Consumer satisfaction surveys

Internship employer evaluation

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

General Comment:

Although the outcomes assessment plan is included in this report it is in fragmented form. It should be submitted as a separate document.

Department *IE*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Capstone course among other methods.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Evaluation team for capstone course. FE exam will be required in future.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Report not clear as to use of results.

Department *JOUR*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Planning for capstone (portfolio)
Exam for all students

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Only the exam is direct learning assessment.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Unclear as to use of exam data.

Department *LL*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Direct measures using standard language exams are described in the plan, but no evidence is given that these have been administered.

Plans for surveying students as they graduate are described, but these plans have not been well carried out and there are few useful results.

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: Difficult to assess the measures until they are implemented. Poor execution of student survey.

Stage Description: Not assessing learning.

Stage Comment:

General Comment:

Department *LL*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Direct measures using standard language exams are described in the plan, but no evidence is given that these have been administered.

Plans for surveying students as they graduate are described, but these plans have not been well carried out and there are few useful results.

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: Difficult to assess the measures until they are implemented. Poor execution of student survey.

Stage Description: Not assessing learning.

Stage Comment:

General Comment:

Department

M.B.A. Program

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Direct methods: M.B.A. Capstone courses

Indirect methods: Student survey
Alumni survey

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Majors changes were made last year to outcomes assessment procedures and additional changes will be implemented this year.

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning

Stage Comment:

Only student survey mentioned.

General Comment:

Although an outcomes assessment plan is included, it is in fragmented form. An outcomes assessment plan should be submitted that is a single document describing outcomes assessment for the M.B.A. Program only or better, including the Ph.D. program in Business Administration.

Department *ME*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Students encouraged to take Fundamentals of Engineering National Exam, Capstone course with student projects, external program evaluation with review of outcomes, visits to companies and labs, exit interviews.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Very strong outcomes program with good design and useful results. Wide range of measures with very useful data.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Very mature program with full department commitment.

General Comment: Outstanding.

Department *M E*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Testing through standard graduate exams, external industry advisory committee, visits to companies and labs, exit interviews.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Fairly traditional use of standard measures of graduate student performance.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: It is not clear how graduate student exams, defenses, etc. directly contribute to outcomes assessment and program changes.

General Comment: Fairly traditional graduate assessment with added component of close industry ties and feedback.

Department *M SC*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: No description is provided.

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: It is not possible to determine from this report if direct measures were applied. It appears from last year's report that they were at one time using direct methods.

Stage Description: Cannot determine.

Stage Comment:

General Comment: No information supplied for 1998/1999 AY.

Department *MATH*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Voluntary exit exam with only one student participating.

Learning Assessment? No

Assessment Comment: Exit interview – measures student attitude, not student learning.

Stage Description: Planning for assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Report indicates that the department is resuming development of a capstone course.

Department **MATH**

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Final oral exam for master's and Ph.D. students
Ph.D. comprehensive exam
In these exams the committee rates evidence of student's breadth of mathematical training. This is independent of whether or not the student passes this exam.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Indirect method also used – Graduates are surveyed three years after graduation.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Department appears close to applying results.

Department ***MGT***

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Surveys

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Surveys are not direct measures of student learning, the ones that are direct are proposed for other departments in the Business college.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

General Comment: Plan needs to be implemented and results used. The report was confusing.

Department

MKTG

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Report includes a college plan.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

The college document provided is unclear as to implementation in this department. Presume student survey used.

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Department *MUS*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Written, oral and performance assessments (juried by faculty), exit interviews. Assessment file for each student is being implemented. Capstone exam for Education majors only.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Assessment questions to be answered are well done. Not sure about the assessment tools.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Although it appears that the planning has been accomplished, implementation is limited to the existing performance assessments in MUS 230 and MUS 330 and senior recital.

General Comment: Considering the ambiguous state from last year and hiring a new department head, the undergraduate Music outcomes assessment is well under way and a good step forward from last year. Implement a capstone exam for performance majors perhaps in theory and history.

Department *MUS*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Written exams
 Portfolio
 Oral exams
 Exit interviews

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Do they have any projects that assess student performance, e.g.,
 performance observation?

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: There are lots of "will be's" in this document, not too much of
 "are's".

General Comment: Good start.

Department

NURS

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Written exams
Portfolios
Exit interviews
Questionnaires
Performance assessments
Graduation rates
RN licensure exam

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

A wide variety of assessment tools, some of a direct nature. Good pass rates. RN CAT test report is mentioned in table but nowhere else – nor is its use discussed.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Serious use of results.

General Comment:

Comprehensive outcomes assessment effort. It would have been helpful to more clearly separate the Undergraduate and Graduate pieces.

Department

NURS

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Survey
Placement
Clinical specialty designation
Doctoral program admissions
Grades

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Most are not direct measures. One that may come close is the certification in clinical specialties but for all MSN graduates. There was no discussion.

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Although department appears to be using results from indirect methods there does not appear to be the inclusion of direct measures. (The table mentions ANCC report – this may be direct.)

General Comment:

The comprehensive oral exam could be included as a direct measure. Difficult to determine extent of assessment program in terms of measures, activity or results.

Department

P E

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Capstone exams and other excellent devices.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Clear program and learning goals.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

General Comment:

Good job.

Department

PHIL

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Exit interviews and exams

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Small sample size has not prevented the department from using results for evaluation and program changes.

Department

PHYS

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Direct methods: GRE questions given as part of exams in all 400-level courses required by physics majors. GRE - Physics subject test scores compiled.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Indirect methods: Annual faculty review of each student. Department Head conducts annual interview and exit interview with each student. External advisory board conducts alumni interviews with students. Alumni surveys.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Direct methods have been implemented and first results are expected for the 1999-2000 AY. They are currently using the results of their indirect methods.

General Comment:

As part of faculty review students are rated 1-5. The submittal of GRE Physics subject test scores is voluntary.

Department

PHYS

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Direct methods: Thesis/dissertation defense
Written and oral exams

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Indirect methods: Department Head meeting with students each semester. Annual meeting between students and external Advisory Board. Exit interviews with each student. Alumni survey.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Department *PSY*

Program level Undergraduate

Assessment Description: Internally developed use of Pathfinder Association Networks and Latent Semantic Analysis, which allow students at various levels to be compared to faculty knowledge using semantic association tools (what concepts or terms are close or distantly paired to what other concepts or terms).

Also developing specific subject matter tests with trial runs last year and next.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Not a standard assessment by any means, but one which relies on local expertise and research knowledge of our faculty. Quite innovative. Will lack any ability to compare to other campuses. Based on a predictive validity model rather than what might be expected, a content validity model of assessment.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: It is not clear how the results will be used or what changes might be undertaken as a result of interpreting the data. There is not a discussion of changes as a result of data collection, only readings of the data, some of which are contrary to expectations.

The major changes cited as a result of program evaluation are increasing statistical and research design components, including a biology requirement, and including an epistemology component in the undergrad major.

General Comment: Work appears to be ongoing, with a committee in place. The report submitted this year was simply a copy of last year's.

Department

PSY

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

The claim is advanced that completion of thesis and dissertation and gaining good employment is sufficient demonstration of student learning.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

The major change cited as a result of program evaluation was initiating a first-year project for all graduate students – to measure effectiveness of core courses and research mentoring.

General Comment:

Work appears to be ongoing, with a committee in place. The report submitted this year was simply a copy of last year's.

Department

S WK

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Field evaluation
Research projects
Exit interview

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment.

Stage Comment:

Department

S WK

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Field evaluations
Research projects
Oral exam

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Good planning for future assessment.

Department

SECD

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Rated observations, portfolios, interviews, surveys, skill testing, clinical practica, oral and written examinations, student teaching observations. Comprehensive exam (but only to 10% of seniors in Communication Disorders).

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Some are not direct measures but most are.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

The department is making important changes to its program based on the results.

General Comment:

Outcomes assessment is being taken seriously by the department.

Department

SECD

Program level

Graduate

Assessment Description:

Written and oral examinations, rated practica evaluations, self evaluations, surveys, theses or dissertations in some areas.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Most are direct. Good breakdown of assessment measures.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Thorough use of results.

General Comment:

Good job.

Department

SOC

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Anthropology program – uses a capstone course (10 essays and a final exam).

Sociology uses a voluntary exam.

Learning Assessment?

Yes - Anthropology

No - Sociology

Assessment Comment:

Stage Description:

Anthropology - using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Sociology - implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Sociology - capstone course postponed; program is implementing mandatory exam Spring 2000.

General Comment:

Concerns indicated by assessment activities:

Anthropology - student writing abilities.

Sociology - student knowledge of method, theory and practice.

Department *SOC*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Final oral exams - both Sociology and Anthropology or internship report.

Fall 1999 written comprehensive exams - being implemented by sociology program.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Written comprehensive exams - Sociology.

Stage Description: Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment: Sociology - implementing written comprehensive exam and capstone course.

General Comment: Anthropology - greatest concern - students' writing ability.

Sociology - greatest concern - students' knowledge of method, theory and practice.

Department

THTR

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Written and oral exams, capstone performance auditions, placement rates, design portfolios. Good breakdown of assessment tools by area of concentration.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Appropriate to the field.

Stage Description:

Using the results of student learning assessment measures.

Stage Comment:

Because of inconclusive pre-post testing, less use of those results. Others are being considered by the curriculum committee. Future plans for using outside artists in assessing students; creative work.

General Comment:

Good job.

Department

W S

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Starting portfolios
Exit interviews
Senior project
Portfolios

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

In response to last year's review, it appears the program is putting in place measures of student learning although measurement methods are somewhat unclear.

Stage Description:

Planning for assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

The new plan is written in future tense, suggesting that measurements (direct learning) are not yet implemented.

Department

WLSC

Program level

Undergraduate

Assessment Description:

Graduating seniors meet 80% of certification requirements for Professional Wildlife/Fishery Biologist.

Student self evaluation on entry level competencies for entry level manager's position.

Employer Survey

Senior Seminar

Student must prepare a written statement of philosophy.

Learning Assessment?

Yes

Assessment Comment:

Senior seminar and written philosophy statement throughout their program.

Stage Description:

Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment:

Outcomes assessment plan redeveloped Spring 1999. Instruments first used Fall 1999 and initial data being collected.

Not clear what tools are used to assess student learning in seminar.

General Comment:

Need more focus on learning assessment rather than surveys.

Department *WLSC*

Program level Graduate

Assessment Description: Research proposal development in research methods course.
Writing assignments in research method course.

Learning Assessment? Yes

Assessment Comment: Concentrate on writing ability and content of paper or proposal.
Wasn't clear on how proposal was evaluated by faculty for learning.

Stage Description: Implementing assessment of learning.

Stage Comment: Not enough data collected to consider changes.

General Comment: Are written and final oral exams used to measures students learning?