

Annual Report on Assessment and Curriculum Change – June 13, 2012

Prepared by Kelley Oliver, Jessica Vokits and David Reinhold

Introduction:

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from May 1, 2011 until April 30, 2012. 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 results.

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

Cumulative University Results:

There were 428 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Two hundred and seventy eight were at the undergraduate level, 148 at the graduate level and there was the creation of two centers. Fifty-seven of the curriculum changes (13.4%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Two of the undergraduate proposals did not supply the information regarding assessment at the time of this report and were not included in the calculation. Further analysis shows that 14.7% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning while only 10.8% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment. This was consistent with the previous year in which more undergraduate proposals were based on assessment data.

Overall, assessment data was used most in making substantive course changes. The data show that 18.0% of substantive courses changes were based on assessment while 12.0% of the academic program changes and 7.3% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, nearly half of the proposed changes (48.9%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 31.3% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 19.8%. Approximately one eighth (12.6%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 18.5% of the substantive course changes and 9.3% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Unlike last year when assessment played the biggest role in academic program changes, this year, assessment played the largest role in the substantive courses changes.

The results at the graduate level were slightly different from the undergraduate changes in that miscellaneous course changes accounted for more of the proposals (37.8%) than either academic program changes (25.7%) or substantive course changes (36.5%). This large number of miscellaneous course changes was due largely to the deletion of a large number of graduate courses within the History Department due to their reorganization of the graduate program. As with the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (16.7%) followed by academic program changes (10.5%) and miscellaneous course changes (5.4%).

College of Arts and Sciences:

The College of Arts and Sciences had 103 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 70 at the graduate level for a grand total of 173 curriculum changes. Table 1 shows that 5.8% of the undergraduate changes and 7.1% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 6.4% 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	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
A&S				1	1					0
AFS				2	2					0
ANTH				3	3		1		1	2
BIOS		2		6	8				5	5
CHEM			1	2	3				3	3
COMP REL				1	1		1		7	8
COM				16	16				3	3
ECON				1	1					0
ENGL				9	9					0
GEOS				5	5					0
HIST			8	7	15			22	13	35
INTL			2		2					0
LANG				1	1					0
MATH				2	2				1	1
MISE					0				3	3
PHIL				8	8				1	1
PHYS				2	2				2	2
PSCI				7	7					0
PSY	4			9	13	3			1	4
SOC					0				1	1
SPAN				3	3					0
STAT				1	1				2	2
Total	4	2	11	86	103	3	2	22	43	70

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 2 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 31.1% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 48.5% were substantive course changes, and 20.4% 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				0
AFS		2		2				0
ANTH	1	2		3	2(1)			2(1)
BIOS	2	4(2)	2	8(2)	1		4	5
CHEM	1	2		3	2		1	3
COMP REL	1			1	1		7(1)	8(1)
COM	1	12	3	16	2	1		3
ECON		1		1				0
ENGL	3	4	2	9				0
GEOS	3	2		5				0
HIST		8	7	15	2	4	29	35
INTL			2	2				0
LANG	1			1				0
MATH		1	1	2		1		1
MISE				0	3			3
PHIL	4	2	2	8	1			1
PHYS		1	1	2	2			2
PSCI	7			7				0
PSY	4(3)	8(1)	1	13(4)	1(1)	2(1)	1(1)	4(3)
SOC				0	1			1
SPAN	2	1	0	3				0
STAT	1			1	2			2
Total	32(3)	50(3)	21	103(6)	20(2)	8(1)	42(2)	70(5)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

Assessment was responsible for 9.4% of the academic program changes, 6.0% of the substantive 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 28.6% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 11.4% were substantial course changes, and 60.0% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 10.0% of the academic program changes, 12.5% of the substantive course changes and 4.8% of the miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level.

College of Aviation:

The College of Aviation had 14 curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with none of the changes due to assessment and one that was the result of a request from a constituent outside the university. Table 4 shows that all of the curriculum proposals were substantive course 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	D	Total Number
0	0	1	13	14

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
0	14	0	14

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 15 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and two at the graduate level. Table 5 shows that four (26.7%) of the undergraduate proposals were due to assessment and neither of the graduate proposals were 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	2
BIS				6	6					0
FIN	3			1	4					0
HCoB	1			1	2					0
MGMT				2	2					0
Total	4	0	0	11	15	0	0	0	2	2

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 6 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The majority of the undergraduate changes (73.3%) were academic program changes of which three (27.3%) were due to assessment of student learning. There were 3 substantive course changes (20.0%) at the undergraduate level with one (33.3%) being due to assessment and one (6.7%) non-assessment based miscellaneous course change. Both changes at the graduate level were substantive course changes and neither was due to assessment.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	
ACTY	1			1		2		2
BIS	5	1		6				0
FIN	2(2)	2(1)		4(3)				0
HCoB	1(1)		1	2(1)				0
MGMT	2		1	2				0
Total	11(3)	3(1)	1	15(4)	0	2	0	2

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 46 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 50 at the graduate level and created two new centers for a grand total of 98 curriculum changes. The data in Table 7 shows that 12 out of the 46 changes (26.1%) at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while 20.0% of the graduate changes were assessment based. In all, 22.4% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment (counts creation of 2 centers which were not based upon assessment results). The College of Education also had a significant number of changes that were dictated by accreditation standards (12.2% of all changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 47.8% of the undergraduate curriculum proposals and 24.0% 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	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
CECP					0			1	7	8
ELRT*					0	7	2	1	8	17
FCS	1	3	3	5	12				1	1
HPHE		6	7	19	32				2	2
SPLS					0				17	17
TLES	2				2	1			4	5
Total	3	9	10	24	46	8	2	2	39	50

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.

*One proposal was due to both informal assessment (B) and an outside constituency (C) and is counted in both categories.

Table 8 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 13.0% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes while 45.6% were substantive course changes and 41.3% were miscellaneous course changes. One third of the academic program changes were due to assessment while 42.9% of the substantive course changes were due to assessment. Only 5.3% of the miscellaneous course changes were based upon assessment of student learning.

The data for the graduate programs show that 24.0% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 52.0% were substantial course changes and 24.0% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was involved in 30.8% of the substantive course changes but only 8.3 % of the academic program and 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		6	8
ELRT				0	5(1)	10(7)	2(1)	17(9)
FCS	3	7(3)	2(1)	12(4)			1	1
HPHE	2(1)	13(5)	17	32(6)	1	1		2
SPLS				0	3	14		17
TLES	1(1)	1(1)		2(2)	1	1(1)	3	5(1)
Total	6(2)	21(9)	19(1)	46(12)	12(1)	26(8)	12(1)	50(10)

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 50 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 16 at the graduate level for a grand total of 66 curriculum changes. Two of the undergraduate proposals did not have an answer to the assessment question at the time of this report and are not included in the tables below. The data in Table 9 shows that 20.8% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning while none of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 15.6% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. A significant number of both undergraduate (35.4%) and graduate proposals (43.8%) were based upon constituents outside the university (37.5% of the total number of proposals).

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			7	10	17			7	7	14
CEAS					0				1	1
CS		1		4	5				1	1
IME			1	4	5					0
MAE		3		4	7					0
PCI*	6		9	5	14					0
Total	6	4	17	27	48	0	0	7	9	16

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.

*Six proposals were due to both formal assessment (A) and an outside constituency (C) and were counted in both categories.

Table 10 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 25.0% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 62.8% were substantive course changes, and 18.8% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was used to make 8.3% of the academic program changes, 18.5% of the substantive course changes and 44.4% of the miscellaneous courses changes. The data for the graduate programs show that most of the proposals

involved substantive courses changes (87.5%) with one academic program change and one miscellaneous course change. None of the graduate 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	5	8	4	17		13	1	14
CEAS				0				1
CS		4	1(1)	5(1)		1		1
IME	1	3	1	5				0
MAE	1(1)	6(2)		7(3)				0
PCI	5	6(3)	3(3)	14(6)				0
Total	12(1)	27(5)	9(4)	48(10)	1	14	1	16

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 17 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and three at the graduate level for a grand total of 20 curriculum changes. The data in Table 11 show that one of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment (5.9%), but none 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	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
ART				9	9				2	2
DANC	1				1					0
MUS				3	3				1	1
THEA				4	4					0
Total	1	0	0	16	17	0	0	0	3	3

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 12 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. For the undergraduate proposals, 47.1% were academic program changes, 35.3% were substantive course changes and 17.6% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for one substantive course change. Two graduate curricular changes were at the academic program level and one was a substantive course change. None of the graduate changes was the result of assessment activities.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	
ART	6	1	2	9	1	1		2
DANC		1(1)		1(1)				0
MUS		2	1	3	1			1
THEA	2	2		4				0
Total	8	6(1)	3	17(1)	2	1		3

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 and 7 at the graduate level for a grand total of 39 curriculum changes. One proposal was from both BLVS and HIS and has been placed here under BLVS. Also, there was one college level proposal that dealt with both undergraduate and graduate programs and was placed here with the undergraduate data.

Table 13 shows that eight of the undergraduate proposals (25.0%) were based upon assessment data while one of the graduate proposals (14.3%) was based on assessment. Overall, 23.1% of the changes were based on assessment.

As with other colleges, a significant number of curricular changes were based upon comments from outside constituents. Five out of 32 undergraduate proposals (15.6%) and one of the graduate proposals (14.3%) fit in this category.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
BLVS*		3	3		4				1	1
CHHS				1	1					0
GRN				2	2					0
HOL				4	4				2	2
IHS		1		6	7					0
NUR		1	2	6	9					0
OT	3			2	5				1	1
SPADA					0			1	1	2
SWRK					0		1			1
Total	3	5	5	21	32	0	1	1	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.

*Two proposals were due to both informal assessment (B) and an outside constituency (C) and were counted in both categories.

Table 14 shows that most of the undergraduate proposals (53.1%) were academic program changes, with 43.8% being substantive course changes and 3.1% being miscellaneous course changes. A higher percentage of the substantive course changes were based upon assessment (42.9%) than academic program changes (11.8%). The one undergraduate miscellaneous course change was not assessment based.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed the same number of academic program and substantive course changes with only 1 miscellaneous course change. There was only one graduate change that was assessment based (one of the academic program changes).

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
BLVS	1	3(3)		4(3)	1			1
CHHS	1			1				0
GRN	1	1		2				0
HOL	2	2		4		2		2
IHS	3	4(1)		7(1)				0
NUR	6	3(1)		9(1)				0
OT	3(2)	1(1)	1	5(3)	1			1
SPADA				0		1	1	2
SWRK				0	1(1)			1(1)
Total	17(2)	14(6)	1	32(8)	3(1)	3	1	7(1)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

Other Curriculum Changes:

There was one curriculum proposal that came out of the Center for English Language and Culture for International Students. This proposal was both for undergraduate and graduate students, but was recorded here with the undergraduate numbers. This proposal was an academic program change and was not due to assessment activities.

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 in the assessment categories.

An additional category was added to this year's data. 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 not made in previous reports. The distribution between these two categories was nearly even with 56.1% of the 57 assessment driven changes due to formal assessment and 43.9% due to 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 13.4% 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 was at the lowest point since reporting began in 2007 - 2008. This past year, only 13.4% of the curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning compared to 22.4% in 2007 - 2008, 32.1% in 2008 - 2009, 24.3% in 2009 - 2010 and 13.6% in 2010 - 2011. There is some subjectivity in this data due to the somewhat vague responses to question 10 on the curriculum form suggesting that there is no significant difference between the 13.4% observed this year and the 13.6% recorded for 2010 - 2011. 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. There was an increase in the number of assessment-based proposals at the graduate level when this year's results are compared to last year. In 2010 - 2011, only 3.8% of the curriculum changes were based on assessment of student learning compared to 10.8% this year. Previous reports showed 29.1% of the graduate proposals in 2007 - 2008 were based on assessment, 14.0% in 2008 - 2009 and 26.4% in 2009 - 2010. The percentage of

undergraduate proposals due to assessment decreased from 27.7% in 2007 – 2008, 42.5% in 2008 – 2009, 23.2% in 2009 – 2010, and 17.1% in 2010 – 2011 to 14.7% this year.

The provost asked that the report include the number of changes due to updating curriculum to match current best practices. There were 7 proposals this year that fit in this category. A separate column was not added to the tables for this since the number was relatively small.

It is apparent that the intent of question 10 on the curriculum change form (question asking if the change was due to assessment of student learning) is still not clear. 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 comparison between the percent of 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 2008 – 2009, 2010 - 2011 and this past year.

Previous reports have shown that assessment plays a larger role in academic program changes than either substantive or miscellaneous course changes. This year, assessment played a larger role in substantive course changes (18.0% assessment-based versus 12.0% for academic program changes). All reports are consistent in that miscellaneous course changes have the lowest percentage based upon assessment. This makes sense since these miscellaneous changes are rather minor in nature.

Finally, it should be noted that the Academic Program Planning process resulted in a small number of curriculum changes, as in previous years. Some departments that went through the planning process recently submitted curricular changes based upon their self-study. Although these changes were not classified as assessment-based, they do show that one of the intended consequences of program planning is being realized.