

Annual Report on Assessment and Curriculum Change – June 13, 2011

Prepared by Sharon Dwan and David Reinhold

Introduction:

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from May 1, 2010 until April 30, 2011. Two sets of data are included in this report. The first divides the curriculum changes into three categories:

- A. Curriculum changes resulting from assessment of student learning.
- 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 296 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Two hundred and sixteen were at the undergraduate level and 79 at the graduate level. There was also one department name change that is not counted in either the undergraduate or graduate numbers. Forty of the curriculum changes (13.6%) were the result of assessment of student learning. Further analysis shows that 17.1% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning while only 3.8% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment.

At the undergraduate level, over half of the proposed changes (57.4%) were substantial course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 23.1% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 19.4%. Just less than one fourth (23.8%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 21.8% of the substantive course changes and none 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 (57.0%) than either academic program changes (24.1%) or miscellaneous course changes (19.0%). Unlike the undergraduate data in which there was significant use of assessment of student learning in making curricular changes, assessment was almost a nonfactor (3.8%) in the decisions at the graduate level.

College of Arts and Sciences:

The college had 127 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 27 at the graduate level for a grand total of 154 curriculum changes. Table 1 shows that 21.3% of the undergraduate changes and 3.7% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 18.2% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment.

Table 1 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program			Total Number	Graduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C		A	B	C	
A&S							1	1
ANTH	1	1	3	5				0
BIOS			16	16			11	11
CHEM			0	0			2	2
COMP REL			34	34				0
COMM			11	11			2	2
ENGL		1	1	2				0
ENVS	4		2	6				0
GEOG			4	4			4	4
GEOS			2	2			1	1
GWS	1		1	2				0
HIST	3			3				0
LANG	2	1	5	8				0
MATH		2	3	5				0
PHIL			2	2				0
PHYS			1	1				0
PSCI			4	4				0
PSY	15		2	17				0
SCI ED			2	2			2	2
SOC			1	1				
SPAN	1			1				0
STAT			1	1	1		3	4
Total	27	5	95	127	1	0	26	27

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 13.4% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 55.1% were substantial course changes, and 31.5% were miscellaneous course changes.

Table 2 – Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	
A&S						1		1
ANTH	1	3(1)	1	5(1)				0
BIOS		4	12	16		1	10	0
CHEM				0	2			2
COMP REL	1	20	13	34				0
COM	2	2	7	11	2			2
ENGL	1	1		2				0
ENVS	2(1)	4(3)		6(4)				0
GEOG	1	3		4	1	3		4
GEOS		1	1	2	1			1
GWS	1	1(1)		2(1)				0
HIST		3(3)		3(3)				0
LANG	3(1)	5(1)		8(2)				0
MATH		2	3	5				0
PHIL	2			2				0
PHYS		1		1				0
PSCI		1	3	4				0
PSY	2(2)	15(13)		17(15)				0
SCI ED		2		2	2			2
SOC		1		1				0
SPAN	1(1)			1(1)				0
STAT		1		1		4(1)		4(1)
Total	17(5)	70(22)	40	127(27)	8	9(1)	10	27(1)

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, 31.4% 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 29.6% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 33.3% were substantial course changes, and 37.0% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in only one of the 27 curricular changes at the graduate level.

College of Aviation:

The College of Aviation had 6 curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with none of the changes due to assessment. Table 4 shows that 1 of the 6 curriculum proposals was an academic program change (16.7%), 3 were substantive course changes (50.0%) while the remaining 2 (33.3%) were academic program changes. 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
		6	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 4 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

A	B	C	Total Number
1	3	2	6

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

Haworth College of Business:

The college had 16 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and none at the graduate level. Table 5 shows that none of the proposals were due to assessment, but almost a third (31.3%) were due to requests from organizations outside the departments (accrediting agencies, professional advisory groups, ect.).

Table 5 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
BBA		1	2	3				0
BIS		2	6	8				0
BUS			1	1				0
FCL			2	2				0
MGMT		1		1				0
MKTG		1		1				0
Total		5	11	16				0

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. The majority of the changes (62.5%) were substantive course changes.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
BBA	3			3				0
BIS	1	7		8				0
BUS	1			1				0
FCL		2		2				0
MGMT			1	1				0
MKTG		1		1				0
Total	5	10	1	16				0

- 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 23 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 29 at the graduate level and one departmental name change for a grand total of 53 curriculum changes. The data in Table 7 shows that 3 out of the 23 changes (13.0%) at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while only 6.9% of the graduate changes were assessment based. In all, 9.6% 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 (17.3% of all changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 26.1% of the undergraduate curriculum proposals and 26.7% 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
ELRT			1	1	1			1
FCS	1	1	3	5				0
HPER			10	10		2	1	3
SPLS				0		4	11	15
TLES	2	2	3	7	1		9	10
Total	3	3	17	23	2	6	21	29

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 39.1% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes while 56.5% were substantive course changes. There was only 1 miscellaneous course change at the undergraduate level. The data for the graduate programs show that 17.2% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 69.0% were substantial course changes and 13.8% were 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	1			1	1(1)			1(1)
FCS	4(1)	1		5(1)				0
HPER	2	7	1	10	1	1	1	3
SPLS				0	1	12	2	15
TLES	2(1)	5(1)		7(2)	2	7	1(1)	10(1)
Total	9(2)	13(1)	1	23(3)	5(1)	20	4(1)	29(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 12 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 12 at the graduate level for a grand total of 24 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that 25.0% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning while none 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		6	8			1	1
CEAS	1			1				0
CS			3	3				0
PCI				0			11	11
Total	3	0	9	12	0	0	12	12

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 33.3% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 58.3% were substantive course changes, and 8.3% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was used to make one of the academic program changes and 2 of the substantive course changes. The data for the graduate programs show that most of the proposals involved substantive courses changes (91.7%) with one academic program change. There were no miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level and none of the changes was due to assessment data.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE		7(2)	1	8(1)		1		1
CEAS	1(1)			1(1)				0
CS	3			3				0
PCI				0	1	10		11
Total	4(1)	7(2)	1	12(3)	1	11	0	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 14 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and two at the graduate level for a grand total of 16 curriculum changes. The data in Table 11 show that three of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment (21.4%), but neither of the graduate changes was the result of assessment.

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			1	1				0
DANC			1	1				0
MUS		4	2	6		1	1	2
THEA	3		3	6				0
								0
Total	3	4	7	14	0	1	1	2

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. For the undergraduate proposals, 14.3% were academic program changes, 57.1% were substantive course changes and 28.6% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for one academic program change and 2 substantive course changes. One graduate curricular change was at the academic program level and one was a substantive course change. Neither was the result of assessment activities.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ART			1	1				0
DANC			1	1				0
MUS	1	4	1	6	1	1		2
THEA	1(1)	4(2)	1	6(3)				0
Total	2(1)	8(2)	4	14(3)	1	1		2

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

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

College of Health and Human Services:

The college had 12 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 9 at the graduate level for a grand total of 21 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that none of the 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
GRN			1	1				0
HOL			4	4			1	1
IHS			2	2				0
NUR			4	4			3	3
OT				0			1	1
SPADA				0			1	1
SPPA			1	1		1	1	2
SWRK				0			1	1
Total	0	0	12	12	0	1	8	9

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 (66.7%) were substantive course changes, with 25.0% being academic program changes and 8.3% being miscellaneous course changes. Results were somewhat different for the graduate curriculum changes in that substantive course changes and academic program changes each accounted for 44.4% of the graduate proposals with only 1 miscellaneous course change.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
GNR		1		1				0
HOL		3	1	4		1		0
IHS	2			2				0
NUR	1	3		4	1	1	1	3
OT				0	1			1
SPADA				0	1			1
SPPA		1		1		2		2
SWRK					1			1
Total	3	8	1	12	4	4	1	9

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. There was one academic program change that was based upon assessment data and 5 substantive course changes that were not based upon assessment of student learning results.

Summary:

Several observations can be made from the 2010 – 2011 data. First, the percentage of curriculum changes attributed to assessment of student learning dropped significantly this year compared to the three previous years. This past year, only 13.6% of the curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning compared to 22.4% in 2007 – 2008, 32.1% in 2008 – 2009 and 24.3% in 2009 – 2010. It should be noted that the 2008 – 2009 numbers were somewhat inflated due to the fact that changes required by an outside body were included in with the assessment-based changes. The largest decrease was in the curriculum proposals at the graduate level. This past year, only 3.8% of the curriculum changes were based on assessment of student learning compared to 29.1% in 2007 – 2008, 14.0% in 2008 – 2009 and 26.4% in 2009 – 2010. The percentage of undergraduate proposals due to assessment also decreased from 27.7% in 2007 – 2008, 42.5% in 2008 – 2009 and 23.2% in 2009 – 2010 to 17.1% this past year, but the decrease was not as dramatic as that for the graduate proposals. There is some subjectivity in this data due to the somewhat vague responses to question 10 on the curriculum form. This, however, probably does not account for the significant decrease.

Second, there seems to be a decreased reliance on surveys. It was noted in the last two reports that most assessment-based curriculum changes were the result of surveys. This did not seem to be the case this year. This decrease in the use of survey data may partially explain the decrease in the number of assessment-based curriculum changes. One theory is that departments aren't doing as much indirect assessment (surveys), but haven't replaced it with direct measures. The University Assessment Steering Committee should begin discussions of this issue in the coming year. This may also be a topic for the Third Annual Assessment in Action Day to be held in March of 2012. 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 comparison between the undergraduate and graduate curriculum changes due to assessment of student learning are not consistent from year to year. In both 2007 – 2008 and 2009 – 2010, the percentage of assessment –based graduate curriculum proposals was higher than the percentage of assessment-based undergraduate proposals. That trend was reversed in both 2008 – 2009 and this past year.

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 recently submitted curricular changes based upon their self-study. Specific examples were the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation in the College of Education and Human Development 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.