

ASSESSMENT AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2014 - 15



August 1, 2015

Prepared by:

Dave Reinhold

Kelley Oliver

Tonya Dean

INTRODUCTION

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from July 1, 2014 until June 30, 2015.

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 487 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Two hundred and seventy-three were at the undergraduate level and 212 at the graduate level. There was also the creation of one new department and one proposal that dealt with an Accelerated Graduate Degree Program. Sixty-five of the curriculum changes (13.3%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 15.4% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 10.8% 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 academic program changes. The data show that 19.7% of academic program changes were based on assessment of student learning while 12.6% of the substantive course and 7.5% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, almost half of the proposed changes (45.1%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 17.9% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 37.0%. Slightly less than 1/6 (16.3%) of the substantive course changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 15.8% of the academic program changes and 12.7% 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 (58.8%) than either academic program changes (14.2%) or miscellaneous course changes (27.0%). Unlike the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in academic program changes (33.3%) followed by substantive course changes (10.0%) and miscellaneous course changes (3.5%).

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 95 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 34 at the graduate level. One curriculum change involved the Accelerated Graduate Degree Program in Geosciences and was not counted as either an undergraduate or graduate level change. Thus, the total number of proposals was 130, but the tables show 129 changes.

Table 1 shows that 11.6% of the undergraduate changes and 41.2% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 19.4% 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 41.1% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 55.8% were substantive course changes, and 3.2% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was responsible for 10.3% of the academic program changes, 13.2% of the substantive course changes, and none of the miscellaneous course changes.

The data for the graduate programs show that 35.3% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 61.8% were substantial course changes, and 2.9% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 58.3% of the academic program changes, 33.3% of the substantive course changes and none 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				2	2					0
A&S				20	20				1	1
BIOS		1		2	3		1		2	3
CHEM	1			4	5				1	1
COM				8	8				2	2
CREL				2	2				1	1
ENGL	3			1	4					0
ENVS				5	5					0
GEOG			4	1	5				5	5
GEOS				8	8				2	2
GWS				1	1					0
HIST	1			3	4					0
INTL				7	7				1	1
MATH				1	1				3	3
MISE					0		13		1	14
PHYS				1	1					0
PSY	5			5	10				1	1
SPAA			4		4					0
SPAN				2	2					0
WLL				3	3					0
Total	10	1	8	76	95	0	14	0	20	34

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		2		2
A&S	6	14		20
BIOS	1	2 (1)		3 (1)
CHEM	4(1)		1	5(1)
COM	5	3		8
CREL		1	1	2
ENGL	2(2)	2(1)		4(3)
ENVS		5		5
GEOG	3	2		5
GEOS	5	2	1	8
GWS		1		1
HIST	2(1)	2		4(1)
INTL	2	5		7
MATH	1			1
MISE				0
PHYS	1			1
PSY	2	8(5)		10(5)
SPAA	2	2		4
SPAN		2		2
WLL	3			3
Total	39(4)	53(7)	3	95(11)

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
			0
	1		1
	3(1)		3(1)
	1		1
	2		2
1			1
			0
			0
2	3		5
	1	1	2
			0
			0
	1		1
1	2		3
7(7)	7(6)		14(13)
1			1
1			1
			0
			0
			0
12(7)	21(7)	1	34(14)

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 did not submit any curriculum proposals during the stated reporting period.

HAWORTH COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

The Haworth College of Business had 33 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 5 at the graduate level for a total of 38. Table 5 shows that 6 (18.2%) of the undergraduate proposals were due to assessment of student learning while 4 (80.0%) 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	2	4	1			1	2
BIS				6	6	2				2
BUS				1	1		1			1
FIN				1	1					0
MGMT		2		2	4					0
MKTG	3		1	3	7					0
MSL			10		10					0
Total	3	3	12	15	33	3	1	0	1	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. There was an equal number of academic program changes and miscellaneous course changes (39.4% for each) at the undergraduate level with fewer substantive course changes (21.2%). Of the thirteen academic program changes at the undergraduate level, 7.7% were due to assessment. The seven substantive course changes had 28.6% that resulted from assessment data while the 13 miscellaneous course changes contained 21.1% that were assessment based. At the graduate level, there were five curriculum proposals broken down as one academic program change, 2 substantive coverage changes and 2 miscellaneous course changes. Both substantive course changes and both miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment efforts.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

	Undergraduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number
ACTY	2	2(1)		4(1)
BIS	6			6
BUS	1			1
FIN	1			1
MGMT	1(1)	3(1)		4(2)
MKTG	2	2	3(3)	7(3)
MSL			10	10
Total	13(1)	7(2)	13(3)	33(6)

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
1	1(1)		2(1)
		2(2)	2(2)
	1(1)		1(1)
			0
			0
			0
			0
Total	1	2(2)	2(2)
			5(4)

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 43 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 29 at the graduate level, for a grand total of 72. The data in Table 7 shows that six out of the 43 changes (14.0%) at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while 13.8% 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 (53.5% of the undergraduate changes and 48.3% of all changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 67.4% of the undergraduate curriculum proposals and 62.1% of the graduate curriculum proposals were based on either assessment data or accreditation requirements.

Table 7 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Total Number	Graduate Program				Total Number
	A	B	C	D		A	B	C	D	
ELRT					0	3		4	1	8
FCS	1		1	11	13				1	1
HPHE				1	1				2	2
SPLS	3		19	2	24	1		9	1	11
TLES	2		3		5			1	6	7
Total	6	0	23	14	43	4	0	14	11	29

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 48.8% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes while 32.6% were substantive course changes and 18.6% were miscellaneous course changes. None of the substantive course changes were due to assessment of student learning while 14.3% of the academic program changes and 37.5% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based. The data for the graduate programs show that 24.1% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 65.5% were substantial course changes and 10.3% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was involved in 10.5% of the substantive course changes, 28.6 % of the academic program changes and none 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
ELRT				0	3(2)	4(1)	1	8(3)
FCS	10(1)	3		13(1)		1		1
HPHE	1			1	1	1		2
SPLS	7(1)	11	6(2)	24(3)	1	10(1)		11(1)
TLES	3(1)		2(1)	5(2)	2	3	2	7
Total	21(3)	14	8(3)	43(6)	7(2)	19(2)	3	29(4)

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 31 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, and 52 at the graduate level that resulted in a grand total of 83. The data in Table 9 shows that 16.1% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning while none of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 6.0% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. A significant number of undergraduate proposals (45.2%) 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

Department	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
CCE		1	1	3	5				7	7
CEAS	2				2					0
CPE		1	5	1	7				6	6
CS		1	3	2	6				20	20
ECE				1	1					0
EOMM			2		2					0
IEE/EM			1	4	5				18	18
MAE			2	1	3				1	1
Total	2	3	14	12	31	0	0	0	52	52

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 32.3% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 54.8% were substantive course changes, and 12.9% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was used to make 40.0% of the academic program changes, 5.9% 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 substantive courses changes (84.6%) with 1.9% academic program changes and 13.5% miscellaneous course changes. None of the changes at the graduate level were due to 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	3(1)	2		5(1)		7		7
CEAS	2(2)			2(2)				0
CPE		5(1)	2	7(1)	1	5		6
CS	3(1)	3		6(1)		14	6	20
ECE			1	1				0
EDMM		2		2				0
IEE/EM	1	3	1	5		18		18
MAE	1	2		3			1	1
Total	10(4)	17(1)	4	31(5)	1	44	7	52

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 19 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and one at the graduate level for a grand total of 20. The data in Table 11 show that nine of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment (47.4%) and the one graduate change was not assessment based.

Table 11 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
MUS		7		9	16				1	1
THEA		2		1	3					0
Total	0	9	0	10	19	0	0	0	1	1

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, 42.1% were academic program changes, 42.1% were substantial course changes and 15.8% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for 37.5% of the academic program changes and 75.6% of the substantive course changes. The one curriculum proposal at the graduate level was a substantive course change and not due to assessment of student learning.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
MUS	5(1)	8(6)	3	16(7)		1		1
THEA	3(2)			3(2)				0
Total	8(3)	8(6)	3	19(9)	0	1	0	1

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 40 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 88 at the graduate level for a total of 128. There was one proposal for the creation of a new department, since that department would only house a doctoral program, the proposal establishing the department was considered a graduate level change. This resulted in a grand total of 128 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that four of the undergraduate proposals (10.0%) were based upon assessment data while one of the graduate proposals (1.1%) was based on assessment. Overall, 3.9% of the changes were based on assessment.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Total Number	Department	Graduate Program				Total Number
	A	B	C	D			A	B	C	D	
BLVS					0	1			2	3	
NUR				15	15				2	2	
OT					0				6	6	
PA					0				1	1	
PT					0				32	32	
SIHP		4		9	13				21	21	
SPPA				2	2				2	2	
SWRK				10	10				21	21	
Total	0	4	0	36	40	1	0	0	87	88	

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 (45.0%) were miscellaneous course changes, with academic program changes making up 22.5% and substantive course changes 32.5% of the proposals. Assessment based changes were observed in 30.8% of the substantive courses changes. Assessment of student learning was not involved in any of the academic program changes or miscellaneous course changes.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 50.6% of the changes were at the miscellaneous course level, 40.2% were substantive course changes and 9.2% were at the miscellaneous course level. Twelve and a half percent of the academic program changes were assessment based. None of the substantive or miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment, so 1.1% of all the graduate changes were due to assessment of student learning.

It should be noted that the proposal to establish the department was not included in the data for Table 14 since this change does not fall into A, B, or C. This total number of changes at the graduate level here is one less than that reported in Table 13.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Total Number	Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number		A	B	C	Total Number
BLVS				0	2(1)	1		3(1)	
NUR	2		13	15	1		1	2	
OT				0	1	4	1	6	
PA				0	1			1	
PT				0	1		30	31	
SIHP	4	8(4)	1	13(4)	1	19	1	21	
SPPA	1	1		2	1		1	2	
SWRK	2	4	4	10		11	10	21	
Total	9	13(4)	18	40(4)	8(1)	35	44	87(1)	

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

OTHER CURRICULUM CHANGES

There were twelve curriculum proposals that came out of the Lee Honors College, three from the Graduate College and one from the Center for English Language and Culture for International Students. Thirteen of the proposals were substantive course changes, while three were academic program changes. The academic program change from the Honors College was the only proposal of the sixteen that was based on assessment.

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 44.6% of the 65 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 55.4% due to informal assessment. This is a slight decrease in formal assessment when compared to last year. 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 13.3% 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 (2014 – 2015) was just outside the range of the three previous reports that varied from a low of 13.4% to a high of 17.3%. This lower number (13.3%) for 2014 – 2015 is probably not significantly different from the previous low of 13.4%. There is some subjectivity in this data due to the somewhat vague responses to question 10 on the curriculum form but there still seems to be consistency from year to year. This consistency from year to year may be 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 15.4%. 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 somewhere in the middle at 10.8%

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 three years ago that the report include the number of changes due to updating curriculum to match current best practices. There were two proposals this year that clearly fit into this category. Other changes may have fit this criteria, but it wasn't clear from the response to Question 10 on the curriculum change form.

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. The 2012 – 13 report showed that assessment of student learning played the largest role in miscellaneous course changes. In the 2011 – 2012, report and again in 2013 – 14, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes. The results this past year are consistent the first four years where assessment played the largest role in academic program changes (19.7% versus 12.6% for substantive course changes and 7.5% 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 2007 – 2008 through 2012 – 2013. Last year 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. Two changes this year were reported as a result of the new academic program review and planning process that was done during the 2014 – 2015 academic year. Future reports will keep track of curriculum changes resulting from the new process.