

ASSESSMENT AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2015-16



August 4, 2016

Prepared by:

Dave Reinhold

Kelley Oliver

Tonya Dean

INTRODUCTION

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from July 1, 2015 until June 30, 2016.

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 583 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Three hundred and fifty-seven were at the undergraduate level and 222 at the graduate level. There was also two name changes of departments or unit, one prefix change and one movement of programs into a new department. Sixty-two of the curriculum changes (10.6%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 12.6% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 7.7% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment. This is the same as last year in that more assessment driven changes were made at the undergraduate level.

Overall, assessment data was used most often in making substantive course changes. The data show that 14.4% of substantive courses changes were based on assessment of student learning while 7.9% of the academic program changes and 2.4% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, more than half of the proposed changes (55.5%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 12.9% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 31.7%. Slightly more than 1/10 (10.6%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 15.7% of the substantive course changes and 4.3% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Like last year, assessment played the biggest 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 (54.5%) than either academic program changes (29.3%) or miscellaneous course changes (16.2%). As with the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (12.4%) followed by academic program changes (3.1%). There were no miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level due to assessment of student learning.

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 128 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 89 at the graduate level. One curriculum change involved the renaming of a department and was not included in either the undergraduate or graduate numbers. Thus, the total number of proposals was 218, but the tables show 217 changes.

Table 1 shows that 17.2% of the undergraduate changes and 14.6% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 16.1% 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 32.8% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 53.9% were substantive course changes, and 13.3% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was responsible for 16.7% of the academic program changes, 21.7% of the substantive course changes, and none of the miscellaneous course changes.

The data for the graduate programs show that 39.3% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 55.1% were substantial course changes, and 5.6% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 5.7% of the academic program changes, 22.4% 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				1	1					0
A&S				3	3					0
BIOS	5	2		3	10					0
CHEM	2				2				4	4
COM				7	7				2	2
CREL	1			1	2					0
ECON				2	2				5	5
ENGL		1		2	3					0
ENVS				1	1					0
GEOG				9	9				10	10
GEOS				9	9	1		1	5	7
GIS				6	6					0
HIST	3			1	4					0
MATH				2	2				5	5
MDVL				1	1					0
MISE					0				3	3
PHIL				2	2					0
PHYS				17	17	6			2	8
PSCI	1			6	7				1	1
PSY	1			11	12	1			24	25
SPAA					0			4	5	9
SPAN					0				1	1
SOC					0				1	1
STAT				10	10				3	3
WLL		6		12	18		5			5
Total	13	9	0	106	128	8	5	5	71	89

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		3		3
BIOS	7 (4)	3 (3)		10 (7)
CHEM	2 (2)			2 (2)
COM	3	4		7
CREL		2 (1)		2 (1)
ECON		2		2
ENGL		3 (1)		3 (1)
ENVS	1			1
GEOG	4	5		9
GEOS	6	3		9
GIS	4	1	1	6
HIST		3 (3)	1	4 (3)
MATH		2		2
MDVL	1			1
MISE				0
PHIL	2			2
PHYS	4	13		17
PSCI	2 (1)	1	4	7 (1)
PSY	3	7 (1)	2	12 (1)
SPAA				0
SPAN				0
SOC				0
STAT		3	7	10
WILL	3	14 (6)	1	18 (6)

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
			0
			0
			0
3	1		4
2			2
			0
4		1	5
			0
			0
2	7	1	10
4	3 (1)		7 (1)
			0
			0
4	1		5
			0
3			3
			0
2 (2)	4 (4)	2	8 (6)
1			1
2	23 (1)		25 (1)
7	2		9
	1		1
	1		1
1	1	1	3
	5 (5)		5 (5)

Total	42 (7)	69 (15)	17	128 (22)
--------------	--------	---------	----	----------

35 (2)	49 (11)	5	89 (13)
--------	---------	---	---------

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 7 undergraduate curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with 5 of the changes due to assessment. Three proposals were academic program changes and four were substantive courses changes.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

A	B	C	D	Total Number
	5		2	7

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
3 (1)	4 (4)	0	7 (5)

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 51 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 6 at the graduate level, for a total of 57 curricular changes. Table 5 shows that two (3.9%) of the undergraduate proposals were due to assessment of student learning while none 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					0
BIS			3	6	9			1		1
BUS		1		8	9				3	3
FIN				4	4				2	2
MGMT			1	13	14					0
MKTG	1		4	8	13					0
Total	1	1	9	40	51	0	0	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.

HAWORTH COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Table 6 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The majority of the undergraduate changes (56.9%) were substantive course changes of which 3.4% were attributed to assessment of student learning. There were fifteen academic program changes (29.4%) at the undergraduate level with 6.7% being due to assessment and seven miscellaneous course changes, none based on assessment of student learning. At the graduate level, there were three academic program changes and three were substantial course changes. None of the graduate level changes were done to assessment of student learning.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	
ACTY	1	1		2
BIS	1	6	2	9
BUS	6 (1)	3		9 (1)
FIN	2	2		4
MGMT	2	12		14
MKTG	3	5 (1)	5	13 (1)
Total	15 (1)	29 (1)	7	51 (2)

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
			0
	1		1
2	1		3
1	1		2
			0
			0
3	3	0	6

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 33 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 37 at the graduate level, for a grand total of 70 curriculum changes. The data in Table 7 shows that four out of the 33 changes (12.1%) at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while 2.7% 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 (15.2% of the undergraduate changes and 7.1% of all changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 27.3% of the undergraduate 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	
CEHD					0				1	1
ELRT				1	1	1			3	4
FCS	3			13	16				10	10
HPHE			3	3	6				1	1
SPLS			2	2	4				13	13
TLES	1			5	6				8	8
Total	4	0	5	24	33	1	0	0	36	37

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 21.2% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes while 63.6% were substantive course changes and 15.2% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 28.6% of the academic program changes, 4.8% of the substantial course changes and 20.0% of the miscellaneous course changes. The data for the graduate programs show that 29.7% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 51.4% were substantial course changes and 18.9% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was involved in 5.3% of the substantive course changes. None of the academic program changes or miscellaneous course changes were based on assessment of student learning.

Table 8 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CEHD					1			1
ELRT		1		1	1	1 (1)	2	4 (1)
FCS	4 (2)	9 (1)	3	16 (3)	1	9		10
HPHE	2	3	1	6			1	1
SPLS	1	3		4	4	9		13
TLES		5	1 (1)	6 (1)	4		4	8
Total	7 (2)	21 (1)	5 (1)	33 (4)	11	19 (1)	7	37 (1)

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 51 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 24 at the graduate level, and one prefix change. This resulted in a grand total of 76 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that none of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning while 8.3% of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 2.6% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. A significant number of undergraduate proposals (23.5%) 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				4	4
CPE			3	11	14				6	6
CS				7	7				1	1
ECE			1		1				4	4
EDMMS			3	1	4					0
IEE/EM			2	3	5					0
MAE			3	16	19	1	1		7	9
Total	0	0	12	39	51	1	1	0	22	24

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 35.3% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 39.2% were substantive course changes, and 25.5% were miscellaneous course changes. None of the undergraduate changes were the result of assessment of student learning. The data for the graduate programs show that most of the proposals involved substantive courses changes (83.3%) with 16.7% academic program changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 8.3% of the curriculum changes at the graduate level (10% of substantive course changes were the result of assessment of student learning).

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE		1		1		4		4
CPE	11	2	1	14	3	3		6
CS	3	3	1	7		1		1
ECE			1	1		4		4
EDMMS	1	3		4				0
IEE/EM		3	2	5				0
MAE	3	8	8	19	1	8 (2)		9 (2)
Total	18	20	13	51	4	20 (2)	0	24 (2)

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 38 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and four at the graduate level for a grand total of 42 curriculum changes. The data in Table 11 show that two of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment (5.3%) and three (7.9%) were done in response to organizations outside the university. One of the four (25.2%) graduate level changes were due to assessment of student learning.

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
ART				16	16				1	1
DANC				7	7					0
MUS	1	1	3	9	14		1		2	3
THEA				1	1					0
Total	1	1	3	33	38	0	1	0	3	4

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, 18.4% were academic program changes, 76.3% were substantive course changes and 5.3% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for 3.4% of the substantive course changes and 50.0% of the miscellaneous course changes. One of the curriculum proposals at the graduate level was an academic program change and 3 were substantive course changes. The only graduate level change attribute to assessment of student learning was a substantive course change.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ART	2	14		16	1			1
DANC	1	6		7				0
MUS	4	8 (1)	2 (1)	14 (2)		3 (1)		3 (1)
THEA		1		1				0
Total	7	29 (1)	2 (1)	38 (2)	1	3 (1)	0	4 (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 42 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 57 at the graduate level, one proposal to change the name of a department, and one proposal that switched programs from one department to another. This resulted in a grand total of 101 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that ten of the undergraduate proposals (23.8%) were based upon assessment data while none of the graduate proposals were based on assessment. Overall, 20.0% of the changes were based on assessment.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Undergraduate Program						Graduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
BLVS				1	1					0
NUR				8	8			6	19	25
OT				2	2				1	1
PA		2			2					0
SIHP	2	6		12	20				24	24
SPPA				6	6					0
SWRK				3	3			3	4	7
Total	2	8	0	32	42	0	0	9	48	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 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Table 14 shows that most of the undergraduate proposals (50.0%) were substantive course changes, with academic program changes making up 47.6% and miscellaneous course changes 2.3% of the proposals. Assessment based changes were observed in 5.0% of the academic program changes, 42.9% of the substantive courses changes and the one miscellaneous course change was not based upon assessment of student learning.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 40.4% of the changes were at the substantive course level, 17.5% were academic program changes and 42.1% were at the miscellaneous course level. None of the graduate curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Total Number	Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number		A	B	C	Total Number
BLVS	1			1				0	
NUR	7	1		8	7	7	11	25	
OT	2			2		1		1	
PA		2 (2)		2 (2)				0	
SIHP	6 (1)	13 (7)	1	20 (8)	2	12	10	24	
SPPA	3	3		6				0	
SWRK	1	2		3	1	3	3	7	
Total	20 (1)	21 (9)	1	42 (10)	10	23	24	57	

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

OTHER CURRICULUM CHANGES

There were six curriculum proposals that came out of the Lee Honors College of which 5 were substantive course changes and 1 was a miscellaneous course change. None were based on assessment of student learning.

Five proposals came out of the Graduate College with one academic program change and four substantive course changes. None were based on assessment of student learning.

One academic program change came out of Extended University Programs and it was not based upon assessment of student learning.

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 50% of the 62 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 50.0% due to informal assessment. This is a slight increase in formal assessment when compared to last year but consistent with recent years that show roughly equal numbers of proposals due to formal and informal assessment. It should 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 10.6% 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 (2015 – 2016) (10.6%) was lower than the range of the four previous reports that varied from a low of 13.3% 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 still seems to be some consistency from year to year. This consistency from year to year also appears to hold when only considering undergraduate proposals. The range of the percentage of assessment based proposals in the previous four years ranged from a low of 11.2% to a high of 17.1% with this year being 12.6%. There is considerable year-to-year variation when looking at only the graduate proposals, however. The range of assessment based proposals in the past four years ranged from a low of 3.8% to a high of 27.6% with this year being 7.7%.

The relatively low number of assessment based curriculum changes may be in part due to the significant number of proposals submitted that were the result of Academic Program Review and Planning (APR&P) (57). If these APR&P proposals are taken out of the calculation, the number of curriculum changes due to assessment of student learning goes from 10.6% to 11.8%. This number is still lower than any of the previous four years, however. It should be noted that

SUMMARY

approximately 1 in 5 proposals (20.4%) were either the result of assessment of student learning or Academic Program Review and Planning.

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 four years ago that the report include the number of changes due to updating curriculum to match current best practices. There were five 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) and then again last year (2014-15) the data 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 2011-12 report and again in 2013-14, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes. The results this past year show that assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (14.4% versus 7.9% for academic program changes and 2.4% for miscellaneous course changes).