

Annual Report on Assessment and Curriculum Change – June 24, 2013

Prepared by Kelley Oliver, Jessica Vokits and David Reinhold

Introduction:

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from May 1, 2012 until April 30, 2013. Two sets of data are included in this report. The first divides the curriculum changes into four categories:

- A. Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.
- B. Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.
- C. Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.
- D. Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

The second breaks the curriculum changes down by type. This includes three different categories:

- A. Academic program changes
- B. Substantive course changes
- C. Miscellaneous course changes

Academic program changes include such things as the introduction of new programs, revision of existing programs, deletion of programs, or changes in admission or graduation requirements within a program. Substantive course changes include such things as introduction of new courses, changing the credit hours, prerequisites, or changing the enrollment restrictions or level of a course. Miscellaneous course changes include deletion of courses, changing the title and/or description of a course or changing the course number. The numbers in parentheses in these even numbered tables represent the number of changes that were based upon assessment of student learning. For the purpose of this report, only changes made based on either the indirect or direct measurement of student learning are counted as assessment based. This is consistent with the definition used by the Higher Learning Commission.

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

Cumulative University Results:

There were 402 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Two hundred and forty-nine were at the undergraduate level, 145 at the graduate level. There was also the creation of two centers and six name changes of departments or units. Sixty-eight of the curriculum changes (17.3%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 11.2% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 27.6% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment. This was different from last year in which more assessment driven changes were made at the undergraduate level.

Overall, assessment data was used most in making miscellaneous course changes. The data show that 29.8% of miscellaneous courses changes were based on assessment of student learning while 17.6% of the substantive course changes and 12.4% of the academic program changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, more than half of the proposed changes (53.4%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 6.0% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 40.6%. Less than one tenth (8.9%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 12.8% of the substantive course changes and 13.3% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Unlike last year when assessment played the biggest role in substantive course changes, this year, assessment played the largest role in the miscellaneous courses changes, although the numbers were very small (2 out of 15).

The results at the graduate level were similar to the undergraduate curriculum changes in that substantive course changes accounted for more of the proposals (53.1%) than either academic program changes (24.8%) or miscellaneous course changes (22.1%). As with the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in miscellaneous course changes (37.5%) followed by substantive course changes (26.0%) and academic program changes (22.2%).

College of Arts and Sciences:

The College of Arts and Sciences had 76 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 42 at the graduate level and two unit name changes for a grand total of 120 curriculum changes. Table 1 shows that 7.9% of the undergraduate changes and 26.2% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 14.4% 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				2	2					0
BIOS					0				1	1
CHEM				4	4					0
COM		3		25	28				2	2
ECON				1	1					0
GEOG			3	2	5				3	3
GEOS				9	9				1	1
GWS				1	1					0
HIST	2				2				1	1
LANG				4	4					0
MISE					0				1	1
PHYS				2	2				5	5
PSY	1			10	11			1	3	4
SOC				5	5				6	6
SPAA					0	8		1	2	11
SPAN				1	1	3				3
STAT				1	1				4	4
Total	3	3	3	67	76	11		2	29	42

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			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
A&S		2		2				0
BIOS				0	1			1
CHEM	4			4				0
COM	10	17(3)	1	28(3)		2		2
ECON		1		1				0
GEOG	4	1		5		3		3
GEOS	2	6	1	9		1		1
GWS		1		1				0
HIST			2(2)	2(2)	1			1
LANG	3		1	4				0
MISE				0			1	1
PHYS	2			2	1	1	3	5
PSY	6(1)	5		11(1)	2	1	1	4
SOC	2	3		5	1	3	2	6
SPAA				0	2	4(3)	5(5)	11(8)
SPAN		1		1	1(1)	1(1)	1(1)	3(3)
STAT		1		1		4		4
Total	33(1)	38(3)	5(2)	76(6)	9(1)	20(4)	13(6)	42(11)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

The undergraduate data show that 43.4% of the curriculum changes in the college were academic program changes, 50.0% were substantive course changes and only 6.6% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was responsible for 3.0% of the academic program changes, 7.9% of the substantive course changes, and 40.0% of the miscellaneous course changes.

The data for the graduate programs show that 31.0% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 47.6% were substantial course changes, and 21.4% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 46.2% of the academic program changes, 20.0% of the substantive course changes and 11.1% of the miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level.

College of Aviation:

The College of Aviation had 25 curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with none of the changes due to assessment. There were 23 undergraduate proposals and two graduate proposals. Even though the college does not have a graduate program, the two graduate proposals were for new courses (substantive course changes) that were developed for the aviation concentration of the MBA program. About two thirds of the changes at the undergraduate level were substantive course changes (65.2%) and one third (34.8%) were academic program changes.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

A	B	C	D	Total Number
			23	23

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
8	15	0	23

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 22 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 23 at the graduate level and one unit name change. Table 5 shows that two (9.1%) of the undergraduate proposals were due to assessment of student learning while five (21.7%) 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					0				1	1
BIS			1	9	10				7	7
BUS	2			4	6	1			9	10
FIN				1	1					0
MGMT				3	3	1			1	2
MKTG				2	2	1	2			3
Total	2	0	1	19	22	3	2	0	18	23

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 (68.2%) were substantive course changes of which one (6.7%) was due to assessment of student learning. There were seven academic program changes (31.8%) at the undergraduate level with one (14.3%) being due to assessment and no miscellaneous course change. At the graduate level, most of the changes were again substantive courses changes (60.9%) with two (14.3%) due to assessment of student learning. There were five (21.7%) miscellaneous course changes of which three (60.0%) were based on assessment and four (17.4%) academic program changes, none of which were assessment based.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ACTY				0		1		1
BIS	5	5		10		7		7
BUS	2(1)	4(1)		0	4	4	2(1)	10(1)
FIN		1		1				0
MGMT		3		3			2(1)	2(1)
MKTG		2		2		2(2)	1(1)	3(3)
Total	7(1)	15(1)	0	22(2)	4	14(2)	5(3)	23(5)

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 23 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 24 at the graduate level for a grand total of 47 curriculum changes. The data in Table 7 shows that two out of the 23 changes (8.7%) at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while 50.0% of the graduate changes were assessment based. In all, 29.8% 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 (31.9% of all changes). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 60.9% of the undergraduate curriculum proposals and 62.5% 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
ELRT				1	1	3	9		4	16
FCS			4	5	9			1		1
HPHE			7		7				1	1
SPLS					0				1	1
TLES	2		1	3	6			2	3	7
Total	2	0	12	9	23	3	9	3	9	24

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

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

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

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 47.8% were substantive course changes and 13.0% were miscellaneous course changes. None of the miscellaneous or substantive course changes were due to assessment of student learning while 22.2% of the academic program changes were assessment based. The data for the graduate programs show that 37.5% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 41.7% were substantial course changes and 20.8% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was involved in 80.0% of the substantive course changes, 33.3 % of the academic program changes 20.0% of the 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	5(3)	9(8)	2(1)	16(2)
FCS	6	3		9		1		1
HPHE	1	6		7	1			1
SPLS				0	1			1
TLES	2(2)	1	3	6(2)	2		3	5
Total	9(2)	11	3	23(2)	9(3)	10(8)	5(1)	24(12)

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 55 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 36 at the graduate level and two unit name changes for a grand total of 93 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that 5.5% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning while 16.7% of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 9.7% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. A significant number of undergraduate proposals (20.0%) were based upon recommendations from constituents outside the university. None of the graduate changes were due to recommendations from outside constituents.

Table 9 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
CCE			2	4	6					0
CEAS	1	2		1	4				1	1
CS			3	2	5		6			6
ECE				2	2				7	7
IME			4	3	7					0
MAE				22	22				16	16
PCI			2	7	9				6	6
Total	1	2	11	41	55	0	6	0	30	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.

Table 10 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 52.7% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 38.2% were substantive course changes, and 9.1% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was used to make 3.2% of the academic program changes, 9.5% of the substantive course changes and none of the miscellaneous courses changes. The data for the graduate programs show that most of the proposals involved substantive courses changes (58.3%) with 36.1% academic program changes and 5.6% miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 16.7% of the

curriculum changes at the graduate level with both miscellaneous coursed changes due to assessment, 4.8% of the substantive courses changes assessment based and 23.1% of the academic program changes attributed to assessment activities.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE	2	3	1	6				0
CEAS	1(1)	3(2)		4(3)	1			1
CS	2	3		5	3(3)	1(1)	2(2)	6(6)
ECE	1	1		2	2	5		7
IME	3	2	2	7				0
MAE	14	8		22	3	13		16
PCI	6	1	2	9	4	2		6
Total	29(1)	21(2)	5	55(3)	13(3)	21(1)	2(2)	36(6)

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 35 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and one at the graduate level for a grand total of 36 curriculum changes. The data in Table 11 show that twelve of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment (34.3%) and the one graduate change was not assessment based.

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			1		1					0
DANC	1			1	2					0
MUS	2	1	5	12	20				1	1
THEA	8			4	12					0
Total	11	1	6	17	35	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.

Table 12 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. For the undergraduate proposals, 31.4% were academic program changes, 68.6% were substantive course changes and there were no miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was credited for 36.4% of the academic program changes and 33.3% of the substantive course changes. The curriculum proposal at the graduate level was a substantive course change and was not due to assessment of student learning.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	
ART	1			1				0
DANC	1(1)	1		2(1)				0
MUS	6	14(3)		20(3)		1		1
THEA	3(3)	9(5)		12(8)				0
Total	11(4)	24(8)	0	35(12)		1		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 11 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 17 at the graduate level and two proposals for centers resulting in a grand total of 30 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that two of the undergraduate proposals (18.2%) were based upon assessment data while six of the graduate proposals (35.3%) were based on assessment. Overall, 28.6% of the changes were based on assessment.

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					0	6				6
HOL				2	2					0
IHS	1	1		1	3				2	2
NUR				4	4				5	5
OT					0				1	1
SPADA					0			1	2	3
SPPA				2	0					0
Total	1	1	0	9	11	6	0	1	10	17

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 14 shows that most of the undergraduate proposals (63.6%) were substantive course changes, with both miscellaneous course changes and academic program changes making up 18.2% of the proposals. Assessment based changes were only observed in the substantial course changes (28.6%). Thus, the total percentage of curriculum changes at the undergraduate level based on assessment of student learning was 18.2%

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 52.9% of the changes were at the substantive course level, 41.2% were at the miscellaneous course level and there was only one academic program change. The one academic program change was assessment based, as were 55.6% of the

substantive course changes. None of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment, so 35.3% of all the graduate changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
BLVS					1(1)	5(5)		6(6)
HOL		2		2				0
IHS		2(2)	1	3(2)		2		2
NUR	2	2		4		2	3	5
OT				0			1	1
SPADA				0			3	3
SPPA		1	1	2				0
Total	2	7(2)	2	11(2)	1(1)	9(5)	7	17(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 two curriculum proposals that came out of the Lee Honors College and three from Extended University Programs. Four of the five proposals were at the undergraduate level, while one of the EUP proposals was a unit name change. One of the LHC proposals was due to informal assessment and one of the EUP proposals was the result of comments from our 2010 Higher Learning Commission accreditation visit report (organization outside the university).

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 last year's report. The distribution between these two categories shows that 63.2% of the 68 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 36.8% due to informal assessment. This is a slight increase in formal assessment when compared to last year. 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 17.3% 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 increased this year (17.3%) from what it had been the previous two years (13.6% in 2010 – 2011 and 13.4% in 2011 – 2012). There is some subjectivity in this data due to the somewhat vague responses to question 10 on the curriculum form so the increase may or may not be significant. There was a substantial increase in the number of assessment-based proposals at the graduate level this year (27.6%) when compared to the last two years (3.8% in 2010 – 2011 and 10.8% in 2011 – 2012). The number of undergraduate proposals based on assessment of student learning, however, decreased from 17.1% in 2010 – 2011 to 14.7% last year and 11.2% this year.

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 last year that the report include the number of changes due to updating curriculum to match current best practices. There were 5 proposals this year that fit in this category.

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 first four reports (2007 – 2008 through 2010 – 2011) showed that assessment played a larger role in academic program changes than either substantive or miscellaneous course changes. Last year, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (18.0%). This year, assessment of student learning played the largest role in miscellaneous course changes (29.8% versus 17.6% for substantive course changes and 12.4% for academic program changes).

Finally, it should be noted that the Academic Program Planning process resulted in a small number of curriculum changes (6), as has been reported 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.