

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

West Liberty University Board of Governors Spring 2013 Program Review Approval And Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

Consent Items

B.S. Business Administration and B.S. Business Information Systems

The Board of Governors is asked to approve the five-year program review for the B.S. in Business Administration and the B.S. in Business Information Systems programs with corrective action focused on further development of the programs' assessment plan.

B.A. and B.S. Social Sciences

The Board of Governors is asked to approve the five-year program review for the B.A. and B.S. in Social Sciences program with corrective action focused on further development of the programs' assessment plan.

The following Assessment Reports for the 2012-13 academic year are presented before the West Liberty University Board of Governors for approval:

- Biology
- Communications
- Dental Hygiene
- English
- Exercise Physiology
- Medical Laboratory Science
- Nursing
- Regents

These reports are required as part of the continuous program review cycle. The reports are reviewed in the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee, and Committee recommendations are disseminated to all stakeholders.

The following are the recommendations for each program's assessment plan:

- Biology (Assessment Report Approved) Exemplary Assessment Program
Next assessment review due February 1, 2015 in the standard BOG 5-YR Program Review
- Communications (Revision Required)
Next assessment review due October 30, 2014
- Dental Hygiene (Assessment Report Approved) Exemplary Assessment Program
Next assessment Review due February 1, 2015 in the standard BOG 5-YR Program Review
- English (Revision Required)
Next assessment review due February 1, 2015 in the standard BOG 5-YR Program Review
- Exercise Physiology (Revision Required)
Next assessment review due February 1, 2014 in the standard BOG 5-YR Program Review
- Medical Laboratory Science (Assessment Report Approved) Exemplary Assessment Program
Next assessment review due February 1, 2014 in the standard BOG 5-YR Program Review
- Nursing (Revision Required)
Next assessment review due February 1, 2015 in the standard BOG 5-YR Program Review
- Regents (Revision Required)
Next assessment review due February 1, 2014 in the standard BOG 5-YR Program Review

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Biology**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed

Assessment Plan Approved:

Next Step: February 1, 2015 submit 5-YR BOG Program Review Sections I & II

Committee Recommendations

1. In many ways, your assessment work is exemplary. You clearly understand the function and purpose of assessment, and you appear to be using the process to your advantage in strengthening your program. Therefore, the first thing the committee wanted to communicate to you upon reviewing your assessment program is: Keep up the good work!
2. However, the committee did score your program a bit lower in the “Timeline for Assessment Implementation” category on the rubric. To this, we would say: Be careful not to rest on your laurels. Much of your timeline section seemed to be in past tense. In other words, you recognize that what you’re doing is working; however, the committee would still like to see evidence of continued forward momentum. You’re doing excellent work, and we would love to see that work continue on into the future. Therefore, we would like to see you thinking about where you’d like your assessment system and your degree program in the next 3-5 years.
3. Finally, it seemed that your initial statement of outcomes (in Section 1) was not totally clear. The committee actually noticed that your outcomes are more clearly and concretely stated further down in the document; however, the initial statement of those outcomes up front is a bit vague in spots. It’s clear that your program has clear and assessable outcomes; we’d just like to see the clearest statement of them appear in Section 1 where reviewers will most likely be looking for them.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Biology	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Business**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed

Assessment Plan Approved:

Next Step: Submit an Assessment Report (BOG Section II) October 30, 2014

Committee Recommendations

1. Although your report did not follow the current format requested by the Provost Office, the committee was nonetheless impressed with the thoroughness and professional presentation of your report. However, for ease of review, we request the use of the appropriate format for future reports.
2. The committee liked the student learning outcomes you presented here; however, there was some concern over the number. Industry standards for assessment suggest that 3-5 outcomes is ideal for efficient measurement and data collection. As it stands now, you have 7 (and the 7th is multi-faceted at that). We wondered if there was a way to condense and/or simplify your outcomes in order to more efficiently measure them. If the goal is a self-sustaining, cyclical system of assessment in which each outcome is measured by at least one direct and one indirect measure in multiple places throughout the program, this could become too onerous a task with 7 outcomes.
3. The committee also appreciated your commitment to the issue of general studies integration. It's clear that your program recognizes the importance of this integration, and for that you are to be commended. However, it appears as though you are using altered versions of the general studies rubrics. Doing so is o.k. for the measurement of your program outcomes (i.e., using your own version of a communication rubric to measure program outcome #2). However, if you intend to report data to the general studies program, the data may become clouded if you are attempting to translate it from an altered rubric to the general studies system. In short, the use of your own instruments for the measurement of your own program outcomes is a fine strategy; however, participation in the assessment of the general studies program will require the use of the general studies program's instruments.
4. Finally, the committee would like to see a streamlined, focused, and clearly articulated 3-5-year plan for assessment activities and program changes. You included an appendix with a number of meeting minutes and other such assessment activities—activities that all appear to be positive in terms of your assessment work—however, there didn't appear to be a clear and focused statement (as per section 5 of the requested format) of your assessment and programmatic plans for the next 3-5 years.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Business	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable. ←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones) ←←	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year. ←	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data. ←	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Communication**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed:

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: Submit an Assessment Report (BOG Section II) October 30, 2014

Committee Recommendations

1. First of all, the committee is pleased with the work you've done with the student learning outcomes (sure beats the 14 outcomes your program was working with in past years). A few committee members remarked that the outcomes were a bit vaguely stated, but we recognize that a certain level of vagueness is necessary in order for them to encompass all of your myriad tracks. So as long as these are working for you, they're working for us. As you get further into your assessment work, you'll likely get some clarity on whether or not the outcomes are useful in their current iteration.
2. In addition, the committee would like to praise the collaborative nature of your assessment planning to this point. We do fear that receiving so much feedback on the instruments from a variety of faculty may represent too onerous a task, but we also recognize that the personnel in a given program must dictate the process. So again, as long as you are comfortable with the amount of time and work it may take to develop instruments in this way, the committee is pleased to see this level of participation and collaboration from your program's faculty.
3. At this point, then, it simply remains to follow through. Your program is still working to get its assessment system off the ground, so we'll look forward to seeing what develops in the near future. We hope to see some follow-through in our next update (even if that is merely follow-through in relation to the creation of instrument). Please let this committee know if there is any way we can support your efforts as you continue to launch your system.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Communication	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated. ←←	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable. ←←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO. ←	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years. ←←←	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered. ←	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Dental Hygiene**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: Submit 5-YR BOG Program Review, Sections I & II, February 1, 2015 (most recent self-study serves in place of Section I)

Committee Recommendations

1. Your program is one of our “star programs” when it comes to assessment. Up to this point, your work has been exemplary. As a result, we would like to thank you for your hard work in this area, and please let us know if there is any way we can support your efforts as you continue with your assessment system.
2. The only suggestion the committee has at this point is to articulate your plan for future assessment work and programmatic improvement. We recognize that the continuous, cyclical nature of your assessment system (which is absolutely the standard we’d like all of our programs to aspire to) *implies* a kind of future plan; however, the committee does feel that an articulated plan for the next 3-5 years may be healthy in your thinking about your program and your assessment system.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Dental Hygiene	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **English**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: February 1, 2015 submit 5-YR BOG Program Review Sections I & II

Committee Recommendations

1. Once again, the committee was impressed with the plan you submitted. The plan shows a stronger commitment to General Studies integration (i.e., not just in an outcome, but also measured in a systematic way now), the development of a new assessment measure, and the placement of that measure in more than one location in the program. All of this suggests a real movement forward of the assessment system for the English program.
2. However, the revision to 102 you mentioned in this report does not seem to be linked to assessment data. We still need to see a greater link between the assessment work that you do and the program changes you implement.
3. In addition, much of this plan is still dependent upon indirect measures (the EMCAF forms and the graduating senior variation thereof). This is fine for a start. However, as your assessment system continues to progress, the committee is also interested in seeing these indirect measures combined with more direct measures placed throughout the program. The Spring 2016 portfolios would be a great start toward doing so.
4. Finally, with a strong plan in place, the only thing yet to be seen is whether or not the plan can/will be implemented. Overall, the committee is sufficiently impressed with your plan and would, at this time, simply encourage you to press forward with it and begin collecting and using that data. We recognize that your program is currently undergoing a curricular revision, but that doesn't mean the current students (who are working through the current version of the program) shouldn't also be assessed. We'd like to see data collection in the next assessment update.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

English	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year. ←	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered. ←	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Exercise Physiology Program**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed:

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: Submit 5-YR BOG Program Review, Section I & II, February 1, 2014 (most recent self-study serves in place of Section I)

Committee Recommendations:

1. Overall, the committee was impressed with the plan you submitted. The plan shows a stronger overall understanding of the assessment process and suggests a real movement forward of the assessment system for your program.
2. The current student learning outcomes represent a significant upgrade over what we've seen before. Once again, this suggests that your program is clearly headed in the right direction. The committee did, however, find some of the outcomes to be a tad wordy. For instance, one committee member remarked that SLO 3 seemed to try to jam too many skills into a single outcome, which might make it difficult to measure in useful ways. In addition, one committee member also noted that SLO 4 seems to be a yes/no question (i.e., Did the students conduct lab tests—yes or no?) as opposed to the measurement of a particular skill/disposition. In short, you might want to tinker with the SLOs a bit further, but the current set are a significant step in the right direction.
3. Despite potentially tweaking the SLOs, the committee would also like to encourage your program to go ahead and get started. Much of your report was in the future tense, which is o.k. at this point. You're still in planning stages. However, the committee did feel that sooner is better than later for getting started. As you begin, you will be able to work out some of the kinks in the system.
4. Finally, the committee did notice that the report seemed to suggest a large portion of the burden for assessment would fall to the assessment coordinator. The committee would like to encourage a greater sense of collaboration among all the faculty in your program. The assessment coordinator's role is meant to be a facilitative one, not necessarily a labor intensive one.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Exercise Physiology	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity. ←←	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure. ←←	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO. ←	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program. ←	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years. ←←←	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered. ←	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: Medical Laboratory Science

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: March 22, 2013

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: Submit 5-YR BOG Program Review, Sections I & II, February 1, 2014 (most recent self-study serves in place of Section I)

Committee Recommendations:

1. In the most recent round of program reviews, your program has been one of our “star programs.” The progress you’ve made in terms of your assessment work in the last three years has been astounding. As a result, the committee would like to affirm the work you’ve been doing and simply suggest that you keep it up. Please don’t hesitate to let us know if there is any way we can support your work moving forward.
2. That said, we would also like to see you articulate your plan for future assessment work and programmatic improvement. We recognize that the continuous, cyclical nature of your assessment system (which is absolutely the standard we’d like all of our programs to aspire to) *implies* a kind of future plan; however, the committee does feel that an articulated plan for the next 3-5 years may be healthy in your thinking about your program and your assessment system.
3. Also, in terms of the Implementation category on the rubric, we’d like to see some concrete examples. We know from our past interactions with your program that you are, in fact, utilizing your assessment work for program revision, but we’d like to see you demonstrate that on this report with some specific examples.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Medical Laboratory Science	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated. ←←	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable. ←←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO. ←	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones) ←	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years. ←←	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: Nursing

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: March 22, 2013

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: Submit 5-YR BOG Program Review, Sections I & II, February 1, 2015 (most recent self-study serves in place of Section I)

Committee Recommendations

1. Overall, the committee was impressed with a lot of the assessment work that you've done. Clearly, your program demonstrates an understanding of the purpose and function of assessment, and you've already done some excellent work.
2. The committee is pleased that your national organizations offer so much support for assessment. It seems that you are making good use of the variety of field tests available to nurses. The committee did, however, wonder if it might be possible to add some additional measures in additional places throughout the program. We wouldn't want to see your program become too dependent on field tests. In our experience, field tests tend to be very good measures, but only for certain kinds of outcomes. In order to assess your students' learning more fully, it may be necessary to diversify your measures and their locations.
3. In addition, the committee would like to see you articulate your plan for future assessment work and programmatic improvement. We recognize that the continuous, cyclical nature of your assessment system (which is what we'd like all of our programs to aspire to) *implies* a kind of future plan; however, the committee does feel that an articulated plan for the next 3-5 years may be healthy in your thinking about your program and your assessment system.
4. Finally, the committee would also like to see a greater link between your assessment work and the changes you make to your program. It seemed as though the majority of your program changes came at the behest of your external consultant. Any positive change to the program is a good change; however, the committee would like to see a greater commitment to utilizing your assessment work/data to drive your decision making about your program and curriculum.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Nursing	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Regents Degree Program**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed:

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: Submit 5-YR BOG Program Review, Sections I & II, February 1, 2014

Committee Recommendations

1. The committee was pleased to see the RBA program participating in our assessment review process. We recognize that this is a program that comes with a significant set of challenges in regard to assessment, but we believe some good assessment work can be done.
2. The committee did have some concerns about your student learning outcomes. The outcomes that were stated as the RBA program SLOs were really more program effectiveness measures than student learning outcomes. They don't actually describe what students will know/can do. In fact, the committee wondered if the Prof. Studies course outcomes could be transformed into the RBA program outcomes. They seem to come closer to describing student learning. Whether you use the Prof. Studies outcomes or not, it does appear that a revision of the RBA program outcomes is necessary.
3. In addition, the committee was concerned that the survey seemed to be the measure currently used for the collection of assessment data. While indirect assessment is useful, the committee felt that it would be necessary to add some additional (direct) measures and at a variety of points throughout the program.
4. In fact, the committee wondered if the program entry portfolio could be a nice vehicle to use for a variety of possible direct assessments.
5. In short, the program will, first, have to solidify the learning outcomes, and then devise a set of diverse measures for the collection of data. In recognizing the challenge your program presents, the committee would like to offer any help you may need throughout the process. Please let us know if we be of support to your program as you continue to build an assessment system.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Regents	(5) Evidence of exemplary full implementation	(4) Evidence of completed implementation/revisions	(3) Evidence of initial implementation/revisions	(2) Evidence of planning	(1) Evidence not included
(A) Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
(B) General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs and Essential Skills into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO/Essential Skill into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs/Essential Skills into program assessment.
(C) Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/ adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/ adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO.	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
(D) Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
(E) Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
(F) Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Department: **Social Sciences**

Action Decided by the University Assessment and Accreditation Committee:

Decision Date: **March 22, 2013**

Decision (check one):

Revision Needed:

Assessment Plan Approved

Next Step: Submit an Assessment Report (BOG Section II) by October 30, 2013

Committee Recommendations:

The Committee respectfully requests that a completed assessment report (BOG Section II) be submitted for Social Sciences on or before October 30 of 2013.

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Steve Criniti, Chair, Matthew Harder, Keely Camden, Donna Lukich, Margaret Six, Paula Tomasik, Carrie White