Annual Report on Assessment and Curriculum Change – June 8, 2010

Prepared by Sharon Dwan and David Reinhold

Introduction:

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from May 1, 2009 until April 30, 2010. Two sets of data are included in this report. The first divides the curriculum changes into three categories:

A. Curriculum changes resulting from assessment.

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

C. 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. Substantial 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. Substantial 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 results.

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

Cumulative University Results:

There were 304 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. One hundred and ninety-eight were at the undergraduate level and 106 at the graduate level. Seventy-four of the curriculum changes (24.3%) were the result of assessment of student learning. Further analysis shows that 23.2% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 26.4% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment.

At the undergraduate level, over half of the proposed changes (52.5%) were substantial course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 13.6% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 33.8%. Just less than one third (29.9%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 26.9% of the substantive course changes and only 18.5% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. This pattern is expected since academic program changes are the most dramatic and presumably require the greatest input prior to being proposed. Likewise, one would expect that assessment plays a bigger role in substantial course changes than in miscellaneous course changes. This indeed is the case.

The results at the graduate level were similar to the undergraduate changes in that substantial course changes accounted for more of the proposals (49.1%) than either academic program changes (19.8%) or miscellaneous course changes (31.1%). Unlike the pattern for the undergraduate curriculum changes, however, assessment played the greatest role in substantial course changes (34.6%), followed by academic program changes (23.8%) and had the least effect on miscellaneous course changes (15.2%).

College of Arts and Sciences:

The college had 52 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 22 at the graduate level for a grand total of 74 curriculum changes. Table 1 shows that 15.1% of the undergraduate changes and 9.5% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 13.5% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment.

Table 1 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ANTH	1		6	7				0
BIOS			2	2				0
CHEM			1	1				0
COM			3	3				0
ECON			1	1				0
ENGL	1		2	3				0
ENVS			1	1				0
GEOG	4		5	9				0
GEOS			3	3			4	4
GWS			1	1				0
HIST			1	1				0
LANG		5	2	7				0
LWI		3	1	4				0
MATH			1	1			1	1
Medieval				0			1	1
PHIL			5	5			1	1
PHYS			1	1				0
PSCI				0			1	1
PSY	1			1				0
SCI ED				0	1		8	9
SPAN	1			1	1		1	2
STAT				0			3	3
Total	8	8	37	52	2	0	19	22

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment
B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization
C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 2 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 32.7% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 42.3% were substantial course changes, and 25.0% were miscellaneous course changes.

Table 2 – Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ANTH		4(1)	3	7(1)				0
BIOS			2	2				0
CHEM			1	1				0
COM		1	2	3				0
ECON		1		1				0
ENGL		3(1)		3(1)				0
ENVS		1		1				0
GEOG	4(4)	4	1	9(4)				0
GEOS			3	3	1		3	4
GWS	1			1				0
HIST		1		1				0
LANG	5	2		7				0
LWI	2	2		4				0
MATH	1			1			1	1
Medieval				0	1			1
PHIL	3	2	0	5			1	1
PHYS			1	1				0
PSCI				0	1			1
PSY	1(1)			1(1)				0
SCI ED				0	5(1)	4		9(1)
SPAN		1(1)		1(1)	2(1)			2(1)
STAT					2	1		3
Total	17(5)	22(3)	13	52(8)	12(2)	5	5	22(2)

A = Academic program changes
B = Substantive course changes
C = Miscellaneous course changes

( ) = Number of changes due to assessment results

Assessment was responsible for 29.4% of the academic program changes, 13.6% of the substantial course changes, and none of the miscellaneous course changes. This data is consistent with the idea that assessment results are used more often when significant changes in curriculum are developed.

The data for the graduate programs show that 54.5% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 22.7% were substantial course changes, and 22.7% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in making 16.7% of the academic program changes and none of the substantial course changes or the miscellaneous changes.

College of Aviation:

The College of Aviation had 23 curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with 52.2% of the changes due to assessment. Table 4 shows that 14 of the 23 curriculum proposals were substantive course changes (60.9%) while the remaining 9 (39.1%) were academic program changes. Two thirds of the academic program changes were due to assessment data while 42.8% of the substantive course changes were assessment driven. It should be noted that the college does not have any graduate programs.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

A	B	C	Total Number
12		11	23

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment
B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization
C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 4 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

A	B	C	Total Number
9(6)	14(6)		23(12)

A = Academic program changes
B = Substantive course changes
C = Miscellaneous course changes

( ) = Number of changes due to assessment results

Haworth College of Business:

   The college had 15 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and one at the graduate level. Table 5 shows that one quarter of the proposals were due to assessment.

Table 5 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
BUS			2	2				0
FCL	1		1	2			1	1
MGMT	3	1		4				
MKTG		2	5	7				
Total	4	3	8	15			1	1

 A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment
 B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization
 C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

   Table 6 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. Assessment data was used in making 20.0% of the changes in academic programs and 33.3% of the changes in substantive course changes at the undergraduate level.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
BUS		1	1	2				0
FCL		2(1)		2(1)		1		1
MGMT	3	4		7				0
MKTG	2(1)	2(2)		4(3)				0
Total	5(1)	9(3)	1	15(4)		1		1

 A = Academic program changes
 B = Substantive course changes
 C = Miscellaneous course changes

 ( ) = Number of changes due to assessment results

College of Education:

The college had 3 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 22 at the graduate level for a grand total of 25 curriculum changes. The data in Table 7 shows that 2 out of the 3 undergraduate changes were due to assessment of student learning, while only 9.1% of the graduate changes were assessment based. In all, 16.0% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment. The College of Education also had a significant number of changes that were dictated by accreditation standards (72.7% of the graduate changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 66.7% of the undergraduate curriculum proposals and 81.8% 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				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CECP				0			2	2
ELRT				0	1		1	2
FCS	2			2	1			1
HPER			1	1		3	1	4
SPLS				0		13		13
Total	2		1	3	2	16	4	22

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment
B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization
C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 8 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that all of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes. The data for the graduate programs show that 9.1% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 13.6% were substantial course changes and 77.3% were miscellaneous course changes. The limited number of proposals resulting from assessment may be due to the fact that most of the curriculum changes were minor 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			2	2
ELRT				0	1		1(1)	2(1)
FCS	2(2)			2(2)		1(1)		1(1)
HPER	1			1	1	2	1	4
SPLS				0			13	13
Total	3(2)	0	0	3(2)	2	3(1)	17(1)	22(2)

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 had 48 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 31 at the graduate level for a grand total of 79 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that 14.6% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment while 38.7% of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based.

Table 9 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE			2	2	1			1
CEAS				0			6	6
CS			1	1	2		2	4
ECE	2		2	4			1	1
ID			2	2				0
IME	1	15	1	17				0
MAE			5	5			2	2
MSE			2	2				0
PCI	4	8	3	15	9	1	7	17
Total	7	23	18	48	12	1	18	31

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment
B = Number of assessment changes that were initiated due to an outside organization
C = Number if curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 10 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 41.7% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 47.9% were substantial course changes, and 10.4% were miscellaneous course changes. Curriculum changes based upon assessment results were found in all three categories. The data for the graduate programs show that most of the proposals involved substantive courses changes (83.9%) while the remainder were academic program changes (16.1%). There were no miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level. One out of five of the academic program changes were due to assessment while 42.3% of the substantive course changes were due to assessment.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE	2			2	1(1)			1(1)
CEAS				0	1	5		6
CS		1		1	1	3(2)		4(2)
ECE	4(2)			4(2)		1		1
ID	2			2				0
IME	4(1)	11	2	17(1)				0
MAE	1	3	1	5		2		2
MSE	2			2				0
PCI	5(1)	8(2)	2(1)	15(4)	2	15(9)		17(9)
Total	20(4)	23(2)	5(1)	48(7)	5(1)	26(11)	0	31(12)

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 had 19 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and six at the graduate level for a grand total of 25 curriculum changes. The data in Table 11 show that only one of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment while all the graduate changes from the School of Music were due to assessment data.

Table 11 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ART			15	15				0
MUS			1	1	6			6
THEA	1		2	3				0
Total	1		18	19	6	0	0	6

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment
B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization
C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 12 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change and shows that 21.1% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 68.4% were substantial course changes and 10.5% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for one of the miscellaneous course changes. Five of the six graduate curriculum changes fell into the substantive course change category with the other being a miscellaneous change. All six graduate proposals were based upon assessment.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ART	4	11		15				0
MUS		1		1		5(5)	1(1)	6(6)
THEA		1	2(1)	3(1)				0
Total	4	13	2(1)	19(1)	0	5(5)	1(1)	6(6)

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 had 34 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 24 at the graduate level for a grand total of 58 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that 35.3% of the undergraduate changes and 25.0% of the graduate proposals were based upon assessment data.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
IHS	6		4	10	1			1
HOL				0			7	7
NUR	2		12	14	1			1
OT		3	1	4		2	1	3
SPPA	2		1	3		7	1	8
SWRK	2		1	3	4			4
Total	12	3	19	34	6	10	9	24

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment
B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization
C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 14 shows that most of the undergraduate proposals (61.8%) were substantive course changes, with 20.6% being academic program changes and 17.6% being miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was a factor in all three categories with 28.6% of the academic program changes assessment based, 33.3% of the substantive course changes assessment based, and 50.0% of the miscellaneous course changes assessment based. Results were somewhat similar for the graduate curriculum changes in that substantive course changes constituted the largest number of proposed changes (50.0%). Academic program changes accounted for only 8.3% of the graduate proposals and the remaining 41.7% were miscellaneous course changes. Again, assessment was used in at least some of the changes in every category. Both of the academic program changes were based on assessment while 8.3% of the substantive course changes were assessment based and 30% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment data.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
HOL				0		1	6	7
IHS	1	8(5)	1(1)	10(5)	1(1)			1(1)
NUR	2(1)	9(1)	3	14(2)	1(1)			1(1)
OT	3	1		4		2	1	3
SPPA	1(1)	2(1)		3(2)		8		8
SWRK		1	2(2)	3(2)		1(1)	3(3)	4(4)
Total	7(2)	21(7)	6(3)	34(12)	2(2)	12(1)	10(3)	24(6)

A = Academic program changes
B = Substantive course changes
C = Miscellaneous course changes

( ) = Number of changes due to assessment results

Other Curriculum Changes:

There were four curriculum proposals that did not come from the seven academic colleges. None of the four were based on assessment data. Two proposals from Extended University Programs dealt with academic programs. One proposal from the Lee Honors College (LHC) and one from the Center for Academic Success Programs (CASP) each dealt with a substantive course change.

Summary:

Several observations can be made from the 2009 – 2010 data. First, the percentage of curriculum changes attributed to assessment of student learning has stayed somewhere between 1/5 and 1/3 of all proposals over the three years of reporting. In 2007 – 2008, it was reported that 22.4% of the curriculum changes were due to assessment data. That number increased to 32.1% in 2008 – 2009 and fell in 2009 – 2010 to 24.3%. The decrease this year is largely due to a change in reporting. Last year, curriculum recommendations from advisory boards were included in the assessment-based category. This year, proposals that cited this as the reason were placed in the outside organization category. The reason for this change was that it is usually not clear as to why the advisory board made a particular recommendation. The curriculum recommendation

may have nothing to do with assessing student learning. It is interesting to note that the fall in assessment-based proposals from last year (32.1%) to this year (24.3%) is more than offset by the increase in curriculum changes due to an outside organization (increased from 9.8% in 2008 – 2009 to 20.7% this year).

Second, some of the same observations of the report last year are also true for this year. Most of the assessment that results in curriculum changes appears to be indirect. Departments across the colleges rely heavily on student surveys and focus groups. There are only a few cases where direct measurement of student learning has lead to curriculum changes. Although it appears assessment has begun to be incorporated into the campus culture, departments may need help in designing and using tools to directly measure what students learn. Last year was a single time point, but we now have two years in a row with the same findings. The University Assessment Steering Committee should begin discussions of this issue in the coming year. This may also be a topic for the Second Annual Assessment in Action Day to be held in March of 2011. A note of caution, however, is that not all assessment tools used by departments in making curriculum changes have been identified. Since the curriculum change form does not specifically ask for the tools used, many proposals simply state that the change was based on assessment results without any further explanation.

Another commonality between this year and last is that there is still confusion on what is intended by question 10 on the curriculum change form (question asking if the change was due to assessment of student learning). Again, 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.

The trend of last year showing that assessment seemed to be more prevalent at the undergraduate level than in graduate programs did not continue. In 2008 - 2009, 42.5% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning while only 14.0% of the graduate changes were assessment based. This year, the numbers were somewhat reversed with 23.2% of the undergraduate changes due to assessment and 26.4% of the graduate proposals based on assessment data.

Finally, it should be noted that the Academic Program Planning process resulted in a number of curriculum changes. Some departments that went through the planning process in 2008 – 2009 submitted curricular changes based upon their self-study. Specific examples were the Occupational Therapy Department in the College of Health and Human Services and the Philosophy Department in the College of Arts and Sciences. Although these changes were not classified as assessment-based, they do show that one of the intended consequences of program planning is being realized.