

ASSESSMENT AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2016 - 17



August 10, 2017

Prepared by:

Dave Reinhold

Kelley Oliver

Tonya Dean

INTRODUCTION

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from July 1, 2016 until June 30, 2017.

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 do not 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 the 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 the 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 552 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Three hundred and fifteen were at the undergraduate level and 219 at the graduate level. There were also two name changes of curriculum, two prefixes created, two movements of programs into a new department, 1 creation of a center and 11 accelerated graduate degree program proposals. Fifty-nine of the curriculum changes (10.7%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 14.0% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 6.8% 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 academic program changes. The data show that 12.4% of academic program changes were based on assessment of student learning while 11.1% of the substantive course changes and 6.8% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, more than half of the proposed changes (52.4%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 9.2% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 38.4%. Slightly less than 1/6 (16.5%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 12.1% of the substantive course changes and 13.8% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Unlike last year, assessment played the biggest role in academic program 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 (60.7%) than either academic program changes (25.6%) or miscellaneous course changes (13.7%). Unlike the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (9.8%) followed by academic program changes (3.6%). 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. Finally, all 552 proposals were used to calculate percent of

CUMALATIVE UNIVERSITY RESULTS

proposals due to assessment of student learning. Proposals that affected both undergraduate and graduate courses/programs were not omitted from the calculation.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The College of Arts and Sciences had 88 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 51 at the graduate level. Three curriculum changes involved accelerated graduate degree programs and were not included in either the undergraduate or the graduate numbers. Thus, the total number of proposals was 142.

Table 1 shows that 21.6% of the undergraduate changes and 5.9% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 15.5% 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 38.6% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 51.1% were substantive course changes, and 10.2% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was responsible for 32.4% of the academic program changes, 13.3% of the substantive course changes, and 22.2% of the miscellaneous course changes.

The data for the graduate programs show that 31.4% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 47.1% were substantial course changes, and 21.6% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 12.5% of the substantive course changes and none of the academic program changes or 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
AFS				15	15					0
A&S				11	11				4	4
CHEM				1	1					0
COM	1			8	9					0
CREL				1	1				1	1
ECON	2		1	6	9				5	5
ENGL					0				6	6
GEOS	3		1	2	6	3			2	5
HIST				6	6			1	5	6
MATH				1	1					0
MDVL					0				2	2
MISE					0				4	4
PHIL				1	1					0
PHYS	1				1					0
PSCI				4	4			1	1	2
SOC		4		3	7				2	2
SPAN					0				2	2
STAT				2	2				11	11
WLL	6	2		6	14				1	1
Total	13	6	2	67	88	3	0	2	46	51

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	
AFS	2	13		15
A&S	3	5	3	11
CHEM	1			1
COM	1	7(1)	1	9(1)
CREL		1		1
ECON	5(2)	4		9(2)
ENGL				0
GEOS	5(3)	1		6(3)
HIST	6			6
MATH	1			1
MDVL				0
MISE				0
PHIL		1		1
PHYS	1(1)			1(1)
PSCI		4		4
SOC	3(3)	4(1)		7(4)
SPAN				0
STAT			2	2
WILL	6(2)	5(4)	3(2)	14(8)

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
			0
	3	1	4
			0
			0
1			1
3	2		5
4	2		6
	5(3)		5(3)
2	4		6
			0
2			2
		4	4
			0
			0
2			2
	2		2
2			2
	6	5	11
		1	1

Total	34(11)	45(6)	9(2)	88(19)
--------------	--------	-------	------	--------

16	24(3)	11	51(3)
----	-------	----	-------

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 2 (28.6%) of the changes due to assessment. One proposal was an academic program change, four were substantive courses changes and two were miscellaneous course changes. Half of the substantive course changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

A	B	C	D	Total Number
2			5	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
1	4 (2)	2	7 (2)

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 43 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 29 at the graduate level. There was also one proposal to create a center that was not the result of assessment of student learning. Thus, the total number of proposals submitted for the year was 73. Table 5 shows that one (2.3%) of the undergraduate proposals was due to assessment of student learning while none of the graduate proposals was the result of assessment of student learning. Overall, 1.4% of the curriculum changes were due to 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				2	2				1	1
BIS			1	8	9				7	7
BUS				5	5					0
FIN				2	2				1	1
ISM				1	1				2	2
MGMT				16	16				10	10
MKTG		1	2	5	8				8	8
Total	0	1	3	39	43	0	0	0	29	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.

HAWORTH COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Table 6 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The most common of the undergraduate changes were substantive course changes (44.2%) of which 5.3% were attributed to assessment of student learning. There were eighteen academic program changes (41.9%) at the undergraduate level with 2.3% being due to assessment and six miscellaneous course changes (14.0%), none based on assessment of student learning. At the graduate level, there were three academic program changes (10.3%), 25 were substantial course changes (86.2%) and one miscellaneous course change (3.4%). None of the graduate level changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	
ACTY	2			2
BIS	7	1	1	9
BUS	2	2	1	5
FIN	2			2
ISM	1			1
MGMT	1	13	2	16
MKTG	3	3 (1)	2	8 (1)
Total	18	19 (1)	6	43 (1)

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
	1		1
1	5	1	7
			0
	1		1
2			2
	10		10
	8		8
3	25	1	29

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 66 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 83 at the graduate level. There were also one prefix creation, 2 proposals to change the name of a curriculum and 4 proposals dealing with accelerated degree programs. This resulted in 155 total curriculum proposals. The data in Table 7 shows that 11 out of the 66 changes (16.7%) at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while none of the graduate changes was assessment based. Overall, 7.1% of the curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning.

The College of Education and Human Development also had a significant number of changes that were dictated by accreditation standards (9.1% of the undergraduate changes and 18.1% of graduate changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 25.8% 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					Graduate Program				
	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
CECP					0			3		3
CEHD				5	5				4	4
ELRT					0			1	20	21
FCS	4			31	35				31	31
HPHE				11	11				4	4
SPLS		2	1	2	5			11	3	14
TLES	2	3	5		10				6	6
Total	6	5	6	49	66	0	0	15	68	83

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 31.8% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes while 57.6% were substantive course changes and 10.6% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 33.3% of the academic program changes, 10.5% of the substantial course changes and none of the miscellaneous course changes. The data for the graduate programs show that 27.7% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 59.0% were substantial course changes and 13.3% were miscellaneous course changes. None of the curriculum changes at the graduate level was 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
CECP				0	1	2		3
CEHD		5		5	1	3		4
ELRT				0	12	7	2	21
FCS	12 (2)	21 (2)	2	35 (4)	6	25		31
HPHE	4	4	3	11	2		2	4
SPLS	2 (2)	1	2	5 (2)	1	8	5	14
TLES	3 (3)	7 (2)		10 (5)		4	2	6
Total	21 (7)	38 (4)	7	66 (11)	23	49	11	83

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 43 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 19 at the graduate level, and 5 proposals dealing with accelerated graduate degree programs (AGDP). This resulted in a grand total of 67 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that three of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning (7.0%) while 10.5% of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 7.5% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. Five of the undergraduate proposals (11.6%) were based upon recommendations from constituents outside the university. One of the graduate changes (5.3%) was 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					0				1	1
CEAS				1	1					0
CPE		1		14	15				3	3
CS			1	1	2		1		6	7
ECE		1	1	2	4					0
EDMMS		1	3	5	9					0
IEE/EM				1	1			1	1	2
MAE				11	11	1			5	6
Total	0	3	5	35	43	1	1	1	16	19

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 55.8% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 39.5% were substantive course changes, and 4.7% were miscellaneous course changes. Three of the undergraduate changes were the result of assessment of student learning (7.0%). The data for the graduate programs show that 42.1% were substantive courses changes, 36.8% were academic program changes and 21.1% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 10.5% of the curriculum changes at the graduate level.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE				0	1			1
CEAS		1		1				0
CPE	9	6 (1)		15 (1)		1	2	3
CS	2			2	3(1)	4		7(1)
ECE	1	3 (1)		4 (1)				0
EDMMS	5	4 (1)		9 (1)				0
IEE/EM	1			1	2			2
MAE	6	3	2	11	1	3 (1)	2	6 (1)
Total	24	17 (3)	2	43 (3)	7(1)	8 (1)	4	19 (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 36 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and one at the graduate level. The college also had one prefix addition that could affect both graduate and undergraduate courses and was not based upon assessment of student learning. This college level proposal has not been included in Table 11 or Table 12 below. Thus, the college had a total of 38 curriculum changes.

The data in Table 11 show that six of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment (16.7%) and three (8.3%) were done in response to organizations outside the university. The graduate level change was not due to assessment of student learning. Overall, 15.8% of the curriculum 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				5	5					0
DANC	6			2	8					0
MUS			3	14	17				1	1
THEA				6	6					0
Total	6	0	3	27	36	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, 33.3% were academic program changes, 58.3% were substantive course changes and 8.3% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for 16.7% of the academic program changes, 9.5% of the substantive course changes and 66.7% of the miscellaneous course changes. The curriculum proposal at the graduate level was a substantive course change and it was not based on 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
ART	4	1		5				0
DANC	3(2)	3(2)	2(2)	8(6)				0
MUS	4	12	1	17		1		1
THEA	1	5		6				0
Total	12(2)	21 (2)	3 (2)	36 (6)	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 32 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 36 at the graduate level, and two proposals that switched courses from one department to another. This resulted in a grand total of 70 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that two of the undergraduate proposals (6.3%) were based upon assessment data while ten of the graduate proposals (27.8%) were based on assessment. Overall, 17.1% 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	
CHHS				1	1	
NUR				4	4	
OT					0	
PT					0	
SIHP		2		22	24	
SPPA				3	3	
SWRK					0	
Total	0	2	0	30	32	

Graduate Program					Total Number
A	B	C	D	Total Number	
				0	
			3	3	
	1			1	
			3	3	
			6	6	
			4	4	
9			10	19	
9	1	0	26	36	

- 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 (65.6%) were substantive course changes, with academic program changes making up 31.7% and miscellaneous course changes 3.1% of the proposals. Assessment based changes were observed in 9.5% of the substantive courses changes while none of the academic program or miscellaneous course changes were based upon assessment of student learning.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 72.2% of the changes were at the substantive course level, 19.4% were academic program changes and 8.3% were at the miscellaneous course level. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 14.3% of the academic program changes, 34.6% of the substantive course changes and none of the miscellaneous course changes.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Total Number	Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number		A	B	C	Total Number
CHHS	1			1				0	
NUR	3	1		4	1	2		3	
OT				0	1 (1)			1 (1)	
PT				0		3		3	
SIHP	4	19 (2)	1	24 (2)	4	2		6	
SPPA	2	1		3		1	3	4	
SWRK				0	1	18 (9)		19 (9)	
Total	10	21 (2)	1	32 (2)	7 (1)	26 (9)	3	36 (10)	

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

OTHER CURRICULUM CHANGES

There were no proposals submitted from areas outside the seven major colleges in the year covered by this report.

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 67.8% of the 59 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 32.2% due to informal assessment. This is an increase in formal assessment when compared to last year and shows an increase in formal assessment when compared to roughly equal numbers of proposals due to formal and informal assessment in recent years. It should be noted that a more restrictive definition of informal assessment was used in this report when compared to previous reports. In the past, anything reported as informal assessment was included in the informal assessment category. This year, informal assessment was only included if it was tied to student learning. Thus, fewer instances of informal assessment were reported this year. This could account for the higher ratio of formal assessment and overall relative number of assessment based changes (see below).

The percentage of curriculum changes attributed to assessment of student learning during the time period of this report (2016 - 2017) (10.7%) was almost the same as last year, but lower than the range of the four reports prior to last year 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 five years for undergraduate proposals ranged from a low of 11.2% to a high of 17.1% with this year being 14.0%. There is considerable year-to-year variation when looking at only the graduate proposals, however. The range of assessment based proposals in the past five years ranged from a low of 3.8% to a high of 27.6% with this year being 6.8%.

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) (101). The number of proposals attributed to Academic Program Review and Planning almost doubled from last year (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

SUMMARY

10.7% to 13.1%. It should be noted that approximately 3 in 10 proposals (29.0%) 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 six proposals this year that clearly fit into this category. Other changes may have fit this criteria, but it was not 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 in (2014-15) 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, 2013-14, and 2015-16 reports assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes. The results this year show that assessment played the largest role in academic program changes (12.4% versus 11.1% for substantive course changes and 6.8% for miscellaneous course changes).