

ASSESSMENT AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2013-14



August 1, 2014

Prepared by:

Dave Reinhold

Kelley Oliver

Tonya Dean

INTRODUCTION

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from May 1, 2013 until June 30, 2014. This is a change from previous reports that went from May 1 to April 30. This was done to align future reports with the fiscal year.

Two sets of data are included in this report. The first divides the curriculum changes into four categories:

- A. Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.
- B. Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.
- C. Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.
- D. Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

The second breaks the curriculum changes down by type. This includes three different categories:

- A. Academic program changes
- B. Substantive course changes
- C. Miscellaneous course changes

Academic program changes include such things as the introduction of new programs, revision of existing programs, deletion of programs, or changes in admission or graduation requirements within a program. Substantive course changes include such things as introduction of new courses, changing the credit hours, prerequisites, or changing the enrollment restrictions or level of a course. Miscellaneous course changes include deletion of courses, changing the title and/or description of a course or changing the course number. The numbers in parentheses in these even numbered tables represent the number of changes that were based upon assessment of student learning. For the purpose of this report, only changes made based on either the indirect or direct measurement of student learning are counted as assessment based. This is consistent with the definition used by the Higher Learning Commission.

This report provides data for the whole university, each of the seven colleges and their departments.

CUMULATIVE UNIVERSITY RESULTS

There were 620 curriculum changes processed during the fourteen months covered by this report. Four hundred and seven were at the undergraduate level and 205 at the graduate level. There was also the creation of four centers and two name changes of departments or units and two proposals that dealt with Accelerated Graduate Degree Programs. Ninety-six of the curriculum changes (15.5%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 16.4% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 14.0% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment. This was different from last year in which more assessment driven changes were made at the graduate level.

Overall, assessment data was used most often in making substantive course changes. The data show that 20.9% of substantive courses changes were based on assessment of student learning while 16.1% of the academic program changes and 3.1% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, more than half of the proposed changes (54.0%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 17.1% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 28.9%. Slightly less than 1/5 (18.6%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 20.5% of the substantive course changes and 1.4% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Unlike last year when assessment played the biggest role in miscellaneous course changes, this year, assessment played the largest role in the substantive courses changes.

The results at the graduate level were similar to the undergraduate curriculum changes in that substantive course changes accounted for more of the proposals (48.3%) than either academic program changes (24.2%) or miscellaneous course changes (27.5%). As with the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (23.0%) followed by academic program changes (10.0%) and miscellaneous course changes (5.3%).

It should be noted that all curriculum proposals involving 5000 level courses (substantive or miscellaneous) were viewed as changes in the graduate curriculum. In addition, proposals that had both miscellaneous and substantive changes to courses were only recorded under the substantive course change category.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The College of Arts and Sciences had 132 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 53 at the graduate level. One curriculum change involved the Accelerated Graduate Degree Program in Spanish and was counted as both an undergraduate and graduate level change. Thus, the total number of proposals was 184, but the tables show 185 changes.

Table 1 shows that 28.0% of the undergraduate changes and 18.9% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 25.5% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment.

Table 2 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 23.5% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 41.7% were substantive course changes, and 34.8% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was responsible for 38.7% of the academic program changes, 45.5% of the substantive course changes, and none of the miscellaneous course changes.

The data for the graduate programs show that 28.3% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 60.4% were substantial course changes, and 11.3% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 6.7% of the academic program changes, 25.0% of the substantive course changes and 16.7% of the miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Table 1 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| Department | Undergraduate Program | | | | | Graduate Program | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|----|---|----|--------------|------------------|---|---|----|--------------|
| | A | B | C | D | Total Number | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| ANTH | | | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | | | 3 |
| A&S | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 0 |
| BIOS | | 18 | | | 18 | | 3 | | 5 | 8 |
| COM | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 0 |
| CREL | 1 | | | 5 | 6 | | | | | 0 |
| ECON | | | | | 0 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| ENGL | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | | 0 |
| ENVS | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| GEOG | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| GEOS | 6 | | | 2 | 8 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| GWS | | | | 7 | 7 | | | | | 0 |
| HIST | 2 | | | 38 | 40 | | | | 5 | 5 |
| MATH | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 6 | 6 |
| MDLV | | | | | 0 | | | | 4 | 4 |
| MISE | | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| PHIL | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 0 |
| PHYS | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 0 |
| PSCI | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| PSY | 5 | | | 7 | 12 | | 2 | 1 | 7 | 10 |
| SPAA | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | 0 |
| SPAN | 4 | | | 2 | 6 | 2 | | | 1 | 3 |
| STAT | | | | 5 | 5 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| WLL | | | | 8 | 8 | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 19 | 18 | 0 | 95 | 132 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 42 | 53 |

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Table 2 – Categories of Curriculum Changes

| Department | Undergraduate Program | | | Total Number |
|------------|-----------------------|--------|----|--------------|
| | A | B | C | |
| ANTH | | 1 | | 1 |
| A&S | 1 | | | 1 |
| BIOS | 5(5) | 13(13) | | 18(18) |
| COM | | 1 | | 1 |
| CREL | 2 | 4(1) | | 6(1) |
| ECON | | | | 0 |
| ENGL | | 5 | | 5 |
| ENVS | 2 | 1 | | 3 |
| GEOG | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| GEOS | 3(2) | 4(4) | 1 | 8(6) |
| GWS | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| HIST | | 3(2) | 37 | 40(2) |
| MATH | 1 | | | 1 |
| MDVL | | | | 0 |
| MISE | | | | 0 |
| PHIL | | 1 | | 1 |
| PHYS | 1 | | | 1 |
| PSCI | | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| PSY | 4(2) | 8(3) | | 12(5) |
| SPAA | | 1(1) | | 1(1) |
| SPAN | 4(3) | 2(1) | | 6(4) |
| STAT | 5 | | | 5 |
| WLL | | 4 | 4 | 8 |

| Graduate Program | | | |
|------------------|------|------|--------------|
| A | B | C | Total Number |
| 1(1) | 2(2) | | 3(3) |
| | | | 0 |
| 0 | 8(3) | | 8(3) |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| | | | 0 |
| | 1 | | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | | | 2 |
| | | | 0 |
| 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| | 5 | 1 | 6 |
| 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| 1 | | | 1 |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 4 | 4(1) | 2(1) | 10(2) |
| | | | 0 |
| 1 | 2(2) | | 3(2) |
| 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| | | | 0 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------|--------|----|---------|
| Total | 31(12) | 55(25) | 46 | 132(37) |
|--------------|--------|--------|----|---------|

| | | | |
|-------|-------|------|--------|
| 15(1) | 32(8) | 6(1) | 53(10) |
|-------|-------|------|--------|

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

COLLEGE OF AVIATION

The College of Aviation had 6 undergraduate curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with none of the changes due to assessment. Four proposals were academic program changes and two were substantive courses changes.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| A | B | C | D | Total Number |
|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| | | 1 | 5 | 6 |

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

Table 4 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| A | B | C | Total Number |
|---|---|---|--------------|
| 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 |

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

HAWORTH COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

The Haworth College of Business had 39 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 5 at the graduate level and created one center. Table 5 shows that eleven (28.2%) of the undergraduate proposals were due to assessment of student learning while one (20.0%) of the graduate proposals was the result of assessment of student learning.

Table 5 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| Department | Undergraduate Program | | | | | Graduate Program | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|----|----|--------------|------------------|---|---|---|--------------|
| | A | B | C | D | Total Number | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| ACTY | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| BIS | | | 4 | 1 | 5 | | | | 0 | 0 |
| BUS | 2 | | | 4 | 6 | 1 | | | 3 | 4 |
| FIN | | | 4 | | 4 | | | | | 0 |
| MGMT | 9 | | 7 | 1 | 17 | | | | | 0 |
| MKTG | | | 3 | 1 | 4 | | | | | 0 |
| MSL | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 11 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 39 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

HAWORTH COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Table 6 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The majority of the undergraduate changes (64.1%) were substantive course changes of which 28.0% were attributed to assessment of student learning. There were fourteen academic program changes (35.9%) at the undergraduate level with 28.4% being due to assessment and no miscellaneous course changes. At the graduate level, all five of the curriculum proposals were academic program changes with one (20%) being due to assessment.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| | Undergraduate Program | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------|---|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | Total Number |
| ACTY | | 1 | | 1 |
| BIS | 3 | 2 | | 5 |
| BUS | 3(1) | 3(1) | | 6(2) |
| FIN | 1 | 3 | | 4 |
| MGMT | 5(3) | 12(6) | | 17(9) |
| MKTG | | 4 | | 4 |
| MSL | 2 | | | 2 |
| Total | 14(4) | 25(7) | 0 | 39(11) |

| Graduate Program | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------------|
| A | B | C | Total Number |
| 1 | | | 1 |
| | | | 0 |
| 4(1) | | | 4(1) |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| 5(1) | 0 | 0 | 5(1) |

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The College of Education and Human Development had 80 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 57 at the graduate level, and created one center for a grand total of 138 curriculum changes. The data in Table 7 shows that three out of the 80 changes (3.8%) at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while 14.0% of the graduate changes were assessment based. The College of Education and Human Development also had a significant number of changes that were dictated by accreditation standards (58.8% of the undergraduate changes and 40.1% of all changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 62.5% of the undergraduate curriculum proposals and 24.6% of the graduate curriculum proposals were based on either assessment data or accreditation requirements.

Table 7 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| | Undergraduate Program | | | | | Graduate Program | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|--------------|------------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | D | Total Number | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| CECP | | | | | 0 | | 3 | 2 | | 5 |
| ELRT | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 22 | 27 |
| FCS | 1 | 2 | | 12 | 15 | | 4 | | 8 | 12 |
| HPHE | | | | 13 | 13 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| SPLS | | | 21 | 1 | 22 | | | | 11 | 11 |
| TLES | | | 25 | 4 | 29 | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 2 | 47 | 30 | 80 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 43 | 57 |

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Table 8 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 17.5% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes while 75.0% were substantive course changes and 7.5% were miscellaneous course changes. None of the academic program changes or miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment of student learning while 5.0% of the academic program changes were assessment based. The data for the graduate programs show that 22.8% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 47.4% were substantial course changes and 29.8% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was involved in 18.5% of the substantive course changes, 7.7 % of the academic program changes 11.8% of the miscellaneous course changes.

Table 8 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| Department | Undergraduate Program | | | | Graduate Program | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------|---|--------------|------------------|-------|-------|--------------|
| | A | B | C | Total Number | A | B | C | Total Number |
| CECP | | | | 0 | 1 | 2(1) | 2(2) | 5(3) |
| ELRT | | 1 | | 1 | 7(1) | 6 | 14 | 27(1) |
| FCS | 4 | 11(3) | | 15(3) | 2 | 10(4) | | 12(4) |
| HPHE | 2 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| SPLS | 2 | 20 | | 22 | 2 | 9 | | 11 |
| TLES | 6 | 23 | | 29 | | | | |
| Total | 14 | 60(3) | 6 | 80(3) | 13(1) | 27(5) | 17(2) | 57(8) |

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES

The College of Engineering and Applied Sciences had 95 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 57 at the graduate level, two unit name changes, one center created, and one proposal that affected an Accelerated Graduate Degree Program that was counted in both the undergraduate and graduate data. This resulted in a grand total of 154 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that 3.2% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning while 5.3% of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 3.9% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. A significant number of undergraduate proposals (10.5%) were based upon recommendations from constituents outside the university. None of the graduate changes were due to recommendations from outside constituents.

Table 9 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| | | Undergraduate Program | | | | Graduate Program | | | | |
|--------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|------------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | D | Total Number | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| CCE | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| CEAS | | | | 0 | 0 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| CS | | | | 12 | 12 | | | | 6 | 6 |
| ECE | | | | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | 11 | 13 |
| IME | | | 1 | 32 | 33 | | | | 18 | 18 |
| MAE | | 1 | | 3 | 4 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| PCI | | 1 | 9 | 30 | 40 | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 3 | 10 | 82 | 95 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 54 | 57 |

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES

Table 10 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 44.2% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 42.1% were substantive course changes, and 13.7% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was used to make 2.4% of the academic program changes, 5.0% of the substantive course changes and none of the miscellaneous courses changes. The data for the graduate programs show that most of the proposals involved miscellaneous courses changes (49.1%) with 15.8% academic program changes and 35.1% substantive course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 5.3% of the curriculum changes at the graduate level. Only some of the substantive course changes (15.0%) were the result of assessment of student learning.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| | Undergraduate Program | | | | Graduate Program | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------|----|--------------|------------------|-------|----|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | Total Number | A | B | C | Total Number |
| CCE | | 2(1) | | 2(1) | | 1(1) | 1 | 2(1) |
| CEAS | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 1 |
| CS | 1 | 5 | 6 | 12 | 1 | | 20 | 21 |
| ECE | 3 | | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11(2) | | 13(2) |
| IME | 10 | 19 | 4 | 33 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 18 |
| MAE | 1 | 3(1) | | 4(1) | | 2 | | 2 |
| PCI | 27(1) | 11 | 2 | 40(1) | | | | |
| Total | 42(1) | 40(2) | 13 | 95(3) | 9 | 20(3) | 28 | 57(3) |

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

The College of Fine Arts had 24 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and two at the graduate level for a grand total of 26 curriculum changes. The data in Table 11 show that eight of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment (33.3%) and the two graduate changes were not assessment based.

Table 11 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| Department | Undergraduate Program | | | | | Graduate Program | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|---|----|--------------|------------------|---|---|---|--------------|
| | A | B | C | D | Total Number | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| ART | 8 | | | 1 | 9 | | | | | 0 |
| DANC | | | 1 | 4 | 5 | | | | | 0 |
| MUS | | | | 8 | 8 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| THEA | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 8 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

Table 12 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. For the undergraduate proposals, 16.7% were academic program changes, 66.7% were substantial course changes and 16.7% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for 36.4% of the academic program changes and 33.3% of the substantive course changes. The two curriculum proposals at the graduate level were substantive course changes and neither was due to assessment of student learning.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| Undergraduate Program | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-------|---|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | Total Number |
| ART | 3(2) | 6(6) | | 9(8) |
| DANC | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| MUS | | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| THEA | | 2 | | 2 |
| Total | 4(2) | 16(6) | 4 | 24(8) |

| Graduate Program | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------------|
| A | B | C | Total Number |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| | 2 | | 2 |
| | | | 0 |
| 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

The College of Health and Human Services had 27 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 33 at the graduate level, one proposal a for center, and one proposal that did not supply an answer to the assessment question, and as a result, was not included in the data. This resulted in a grand total of 62 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that five of the undergraduate proposals (18.5%) were based upon assessment data while seven of the graduate proposals (21.2%) were based on assessment. Overall, 20.0% of the changes were based on assessment.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| Department | Undergraduate Program | | | | Total Number | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| | A | B | C | D | | | | | | |
| BLVS | | | | | 0 | | | | | 1 |
| INTERDIS | | 3 | 1 | 11 | 15 | | 3 | | 13 | 16 |
| NUR | | | | 8 | 8 | 1 | | | 4 | 5 |
| OT | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | | 1 | | | 1 |
| PA | | | | | 0 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| SPPA | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | 3 |
| SWRK | | | | | 0 | | | | 4 | 4 |
| Total | 1 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 27 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 26 | 33 |

- A= Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.
- B= Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.
- C= Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.
- D= Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Table 14 shows that most of the undergraduate proposals (63.0%) were substantive course changes, with academic program changes making up 33.3% and miscellaneous course changes 3.7% of the proposals. Assessment based changes were observed in 33.3% of the academic program changes, 5.9% of the substantive courses changes and the one miscellaneous course change was based upon assessment of student learning.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 57.6% of the changes were at the substantive course level, 24.2% were academic program changes and 18.2% were at the miscellaneous course level. Twenty percent of the academic program changes were assessment based, as were 26.3% of the substantive course changes. None of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment, so 21.2% of all the graduate changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| Undergraduate Program | | | | | Graduate Program | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-------|------|--------------|------------------|-------|---|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | Total Number | A | B | C | Total Number |
| BLVS | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| INTERDIS | 5(2) | 10(1) | | 15(3) | 3 | 10(3) | 3 | 16(3) |
| NUR | 3 | 5 | | 8 | 2(1) | | 3 | 5(1) |
| OT | 1(1) | | 1(1) | 2(2) | 1(1) | | | 1(1) |
| PA | | | | 0 | | 3 | | 3 |
| SPPA | | 2 | | 2 | | 3(2) | | 3(2) |
| SWRK | | | | | 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| Total | 9(3) | 17(1) | 1(1) | 27(5) | 8(2) | 19(5) | 6 | 33(7) |

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

OTHER CURRICULUM CHANGES

There were two curriculum proposals that came out of the Lee Honors College and four from the Center for English Language and Culture for International Students. All six of the proposals were substantive course changes at the undergraduate and none were based upon assessment of student learning outcomes.

SUMMARY

It needs to be made clear that the definition of assessment used in this report parallels that of the Higher Learning Commission. Assessment activities are those that measure student learning. Thus, the attempt here is to only include activities that clearly measure what students learn.

Assessment activity was divided into formal assessment (A in the odd number tables) and informal assessment activities (B in the odd numbered tables). This distinction was first made in the 2011 - 2012 report. The distribution between these two categories shows that 53.1% of the 96 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 48.9% due to informal assessment. This is a slight decrease in formal assessment when compared to last year. This is probably due to 18 proposals submitted by the Department of Biological Sciences that were put into the informal assessment category. Even though the department stated that the changes were due to both formal and informal assessment, it was not clear what type of formal assessment was used in these cases. It should also be noted that some of the proposals placed in the informal assessment category might not have been assessment of student learning. If a proposal stated simply that it was the result of student or faculty discussions without stating the nature of the topic discussed, it was placed in the informal assessment. Some of these discussions may not have dealt with student learning, however. Thus, the 15.5% of changes attributed to assessment activities described in this report could be somewhat inflated.

The percentage of curriculum changes attributed to assessment of student learning during the time period of this report (2013 – 2014) was within the range of the three previous reports that varied from a low of 13.4% to a high of 17.3%. There is some subjectivity in this data due to the somewhat vague responses to question 10 on the curriculum form but there seems to be consistency from year to year. This consistency from year to year is somewhat less when only considering undergraduate proposals. The range of the percentage of assessment based proposals in the previous three years ranged from a low of 11.2% to a high of 17.1% with this year being 16.4%. There is considerable year-to-year variation when looking at only the graduate proposals, however. The range of assessment based proposals in the past three years ranged from a low of 3.8% to a high of 27.6% with this year being in the middle at 14.0%

One issue that has been consistent since these reports began in 2007 – 2008 is the nature of the assessment used to measure student learning. Departments are still heavily using indirect measures of learning such as student and alumni surveys, student focus groups and informal observations by faculty. Although these methods can produce valuable results, the university community needs to step up efforts to increase the direct measurement of student learning.

The provost asked two years ago that the report include the number of changes due to updating curriculum to match current best practices. There were 7 proposals this year that clearly fit into this category.

The lack of clarity of question 10 on the curriculum change form (question asking if the change was due to assessment of student learning) continues to be an issue. As in previous years, there were multiple examples in many colleges in which departments explained how the change would add to their assessment plan, not whether the change was due to assessment results. Other proposals explained how the change would help students progress through the program. Although this could be considered a type of assessment, it does not directly address the question of whether measurement of student learning was the impetus for the change, which is the HLC definition mentioned above.

The first four reports (2007 – 2008 through 2010 – 2011) showed that assessment played a larger role in academic program changes than either substantive or miscellaneous course changes. Last year, assessment of student learning played the largest role in miscellaneous course changes. The results of this year's report are similar to those in the 2011 – 2012 report in which assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (20.4% versus 16.1% for academic program changes and 3.1% for miscellaneous course changes).

Finally, it should be noted that the Academic Program Planning process that ended in 2012 was responsible for some curriculum changes in each of the previous years. This was the first year that none of the proposals mentioned that program planning process. This fact is likely due to the cessation of that process. It is expected that we will see many proposals referencing the new planning process that will be implemented in the 2014 – 2015 academic year.