

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health</p> <p>Program: M.H.A. Health Services. & Policy Mgmt.</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO3 Students will be able to apply Communications and Interpersonal Effectiveness competencies (Domain 3 in MHA Program Competency Model) to health services organizations.</p>	<p>2. Our goal for the mean Student self-assessment of competency level in Domain 3 (Communications and Interpersonal Effectiveness) at the end of the program is ≥ 3.2.</p> <p>3. Our goal for the mean Residency preceptor assessment of the student's competency level in Domain 3 (Communications and Interpersonal Effectiveness) at the end of the program is ≥ 3.2.</p> <p>4. Our goal for the mean of Preceptors' assessment of students' Communication and Interpersonal skills (Q 2.2, 2.8, 2.9) in the MHA Preceptor Evaluation of the Residency form is ≥ 4.0, using a 5-point scale with 5 being "Excellent."</p> <p>5. Our goal for the mean of Faculty advisor and Preceptor Evaluations of the Residency Presentation (mean of all questions) is ≥ 3.2. This is the program target for the sub-competency, Personal Communication and Presentation skills (item 3.1 of MHA Competency Model).</p>	<p>2. The mean Student self-assessment of competency level in Domain 3 (Communication & Interpersonal Effectiveness) at the end of the program is 3.8, which exceeds our target of 3.2. Therefore, the criterion is met.</p> <p>3. The mean Residency preceptor assessment of the student's competency level in Domain 3 (Communication & Interpersonal Effectiveness) at the end of the program is 4.6. Therefore, the criterion is met.</p> <p>4. The mean of Preceptors' assessment of students' Communication and Interpersonal skills (Q 2.2, 2.8, 2.9) in the MHA Preceptor Evaluation of the Residency form is 4.6. Therefore, the criterion is met.</p> <p>5. The mean of Faculty advisor and Preceptor Evaluations of the Residency Presentation (mean of all questions) is 3.8. Therefore, the criterion is met.</p>	<p>Meeting of the program Advisory Board identified the following areas to address across coursework in this competency domain:</p> <p>Discussed 'executive presence' and the program's opportunities to teach this and presentation skills. Institute 'coaching' on presentations within instructors' classes. Will integrate a case study across all courses as an individual comprehensive exam into HSPM 770, which could represent up to 20% of the grade.</p>	<p>Measure 2: Average score on self-assessment for this domain: AY2017-18: 3.9 AY2018-19: 3.8</p> <p>Measure 3: Average score on preceptors' assessment for this domain: AY2017-18: 4.8 AY2018-19: 4.6</p> <p>Measure 4: Average score on presentation rubric AY2017-18: 3.7 AY2018-19: 3.8</p> <p>These criteria were met.</p>	<p>The program director will conduct a half-day MHA annual curriculum retreat including all full-time and adjunct faculty to review all the above measures of student performance, curriculum content and global issues affecting the MHA program and make recommendations for changes to the curriculum and program as needed.</p>	<p>Curriculum retreat discussion: While score results in this learning objective have remained steady, during the 2018 meeting, faculty discussed concerns regarding some student poor writing skills. After discussion, all agreed that this must be stressed from the start of the first semester. The group agreed that it would be beneficial to have language included in the syllabus that requires instructors to refer students with writing deficiencies to the USC Writing Center for assistance. The student must show evidence of using the writing center before submitting the next assignment. Information regarding this should also be communicated to the program Director as evidence that the deficit was communicated to the student. The program Director drafted language for the process to include in all syllabi. This is now included in MHA specific syllabi.</p>	<p><MHA Hlth. Svcs. & Policy Mtg. 16-17 Report></p> <p>< MHA link to MHA Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health</p> <p>Program: MS Environmental Health Science</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO2 The student must demonstrate detailed knowledge of how their specific studies fill a gap in the field of environmental health sciences. The student must also demonstrate detailed understanding of specific research topics examined as part of the thesis and the ability to apply this knowledge to broader real-world environmental health topics.</p>	<p>At least 50% of MS students will have a manuscript from their thesis published in a peer-reviewed journal within 5 years of program completion.</p>	<p>The one (1) MS student who successfully completed the thesis during this reporting period is in the process of drafting a manuscript for publication. This is too little data to evaluate this learning outcome.</p>	<p>While ENHS is making progress in addressing this learning outcome, we continue to face two challenges. The first is that many of our MS students are entering the professional workforce immediately upon completion of their thesis. Therefore, the multiple challenges and opportunities of a new professional job take precedent over drafting and completion of a manuscript for peer-reviewed publication. Therefore, the responsibility falls on the students’ advisors. We continue to encourage our faculty to work with the newly-minted MS public health professional to complete at least one manuscript for publication.</p> <p>The second challenge is associated with tracking student-led publications and presentations. Over the past year ENHS has initiated efforts to develop a database of student-led manuscripts to allow for more effective tracking of publications. We are undergoing some administrative restructuring to better support this effort.</p>	<p>As of spring 2018, 8 students graduated in the past five years. Of those, 8 (15%) published at least one paper in a peer-reviewed journal. We need to examine this data further.</p>	<p>With this in mind, we have decided to assess their skills as part of the thesis process in the next assessment cycle.</p>	<p>Over the past 5-10 years, the job market for MS graduates has changed. In the past, most of our students went into jobs where publications were expected either prior to employment or as part of employment. That is no longer the case. Once students are employed, they tend to lose interest in publishing in peer-reviewed journals if it is not part of their jobs.</p>	<p>< ENHS 16-17 report></p> <p>< ENHS Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health</p> <p>Program: MSPH Epidemiology</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Students will demonstrate the ability to calculate and interpret measures of association.</p>	<p>Questions from the EPID 741 final examination will be examined which pertain specifically to calculating and interpreting measures of association will be used to evaluate this learning outcome. >75% of students will average higher than 75% on these questions.</p>	<p>Ten MSPH students were enrolled in EPID 741 this academic year. In order to meet this learning outcome at least 8 students needed to average >75% on these questions. Six (60%) students averaged >75% on these questions; therefore, we did not meet this learning outcome.</p>	<p>The current course instructor indicated that question 5 (part c in particular) was an issue on exam 1 for students. She provided students the solution to that question and repeated the question (4) on exam 2 where students did marginally better. We examined the results for this learning outcome over the last three years. Nineteen (73%) of 26 students averaged >75% on questions for this learning outcome. The results were discussed with the department administrative team, the epidemiology curriculum committee, the course instructor, and will be discussed in the first division meeting in August. We have a new faculty member in August who will be teaching EPID 741 in Spring 2018, and the results will be discussed with him in detail in order to consider possible course curriculum changes. We will report on these changes in our next academic assessment plan.</p>	<p>Percent of students who averaged at least 75% on the exam questions in EPID 741.</p> <p>Spring 2018: 3/5 (60%) Spring 2019: 3/3 (100%) 2-year results: 6/8 (75%)</p> <p>This criterion was met.</p>	<p>Results were discussed at length at a fall 2017 epidemiology division meeting. All MSPH students are required to successfully write, present, and defend a thesis which is reviewed and approved by three faculty members. We intend to change the process by which academic assessment opportunities for the AAP are selected for this learning outcome in order to better reflect student mastery. Questions will still come from EPID 741 exams; however, assessment questions will be written specifically to assess this learning outcome. These questions will be written by the EPID 741 instructor and approved by the division head.</p>	<p>Our students have successfully passed both the progression and comprehensive examinations taken their first and second years, respectively.</p> <p>The Council on Education in Public Health (CEPH), the accrediting body for schools and program of public health, adopted new curriculum standards for MSPH programs. As a result, we have redesigned our MSPH curriculum and developed new competencies (learning outcomes), which will be rolled out in fall 2019. We are developing a new academic assessment plan for the 2019-2021 cycle, and we are using the results from 2017-2019 to inform the new plan in addition to the new standards.</p>	<p>< MSPH Epidemiology 16-17 Report></p> <p>< MSPH Epidemiology Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health</p> <p>Program: MPH Epidemiology</p>	<p>Goal 4: LO3 Students will correctly interpret results from statistical analyses.</p>	<p>All master’s students are required to take a comprehensive exam during their second year in the program. The exam is offered at the beginning of the spring semester. Since we have very few MPH students, we will evaluate questions from the last three Comprehensive Examinations. 90% of students will average higher than 75% on the chosen questions.</p>	<p>Given the very small enrollment in our MPH degree program, we chose to aggregate data from 2012-2013 through 2016-2017 (5 years) rather than three years in order to assess this learning outcome. Five MPH students took the comprehensive exam during this time period. In order to meet this learning outcome, all 5 students need to average >75% on the questions specific to this learning outcome. Four of the five students (80%) averaged 75% on these questions; therefore, we did not meet this learning outcome</p>	<p>Upon reflection, we intend to change the criterion for meeting this LO such that >75% of students (instead of 90% students) will need to average over 75% on the questions assessing this LO. We believe that this is much more reasonable given our small enrollment. We made this change for several other learning outcomes in last year’s AAP. We do not plan any curriculum changes at this time; however, we will continue to monitor aggregated data.</p>	<p>Percent who averaged higher than 75% on the chosen questions on the comp exam.</p> <p>AY2015-16 through AY2017-18 (3 years): 2/3 students (67%) AY2018-19: 2/2 (100%) 4-year average: 4/5 (80%)</p> <p>This criterion was met.</p>	<p>The Council on Education in Public Health (CEPH), the accrediting body for schools and programs of public health adopted new curriculum standards MPH programs. As a result, the Arnold School has completely redesigned the core MPH curriculum and developed new competencies (learning outcomes) for the individual MPH programs. These new programs will be implemented beginning fall 2019. As a result, completely new academic assessment plans will be developed for the next two-year cycle.</p>	<p>The results of assessments from the past two years will be used to inform these new plans, along with the new MPH criteria.</p>	<p>< MPH Epidemiology 16-17 Report></p> <p>< MPH Epidemiology Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health</p> <p>Program: MS Exercise Science</p>	<p>Goal 4: LO1 Applied Physiology Master of Science students will explain, analyze and evaluate: 1) physiological changes that occur during a single session of exercise, 2) physiological adaptations that take place with repeated exercise sessions, and 3) how environmental conditions influence these responses.</p>	<p>Students will complete comprehensive exam questions in which they will explain, analyze and/or evaluate various relationships between physiological responses and adaptations, and environmental stressors. At least eighty percent of the students will pass the comprehensive exams. Due to the small size of the program, results from 2 or more consecutive academic years will be used to assess passing rates.</p>	<p>During the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 academic years, 13 MS students in Exercise Science specializing in Applied Physiology completed a comprehensive examination that included 3 questions (thesis students) or 6 questions (project students). Of the 13 students, 7 passed each question with a score of 5 or higher on the first attempt. Therefore, 54% of students passed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt. The remaining 6 students passed the rewrite. This criterion was not met.</p>	<p>The MS program was revised to eliminate concentrations and the plan for 2017-2018 is being revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Measure 1: 89% Percent of students in EXSC 780/781 achieving a grade of B or better on their paper or exam:</p> <p>Measure 2: Percent of students passing associated questions on comp exam on first attempt. AY2017-18: no students took the comp exam AY2018-19: 1 of 4 (25%) passed. Criterion for measure 1 was met. Criterion for measure 2 was not.</p>	<p>We will also hold a session about the comp exam farther in advance of the comp exam so that students can start preparing for the exam earlier.</p> <p>The MS Graduate Director and MS Admissions and Curriculum Committee will evaluate EXSC 780 to determine if it is meeting the needs of the MS students.</p>	<p>The program has since changed its course requirements. Students who have an undergraduate degree in Exercise Science will take EXSC 781, which is a higher-level course that requires students to write and describe physiological processes, instead of EXSC 780. Students who have not taken an undergraduate course in Exercise Physiology will be required to take an undergraduate course in Exercise Physiology to correct the deficiency prior to taking EXSC 781.</p> <p>The learning outcome was changed to read, “Master of Science students will explain, analyze and evaluate physiological changes that occur during exercise and how environmental conditions influence these responses.”</p> <p>Assessment measures were also added.</p>	<p>< MS Exercise Science 16-17 report></p> <p>< MS Exercise Science Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health</p> <p>Program: MS Exercise Science</p>	<p>Goal 5: LO1 Health Aspects of Physical Activity Master of Science students will explain, analyze, and evaluate the relationships between physical activity, behavior and health.</p>	<p>Students will complete comprehensive exam questions in which they will explain, analyze, and evaluate various relationships between physical activity, behavior and health. At least eighty percent of the students will pass this the comprehensive exams. Due to the small size of the program, results from 2 or more consecutive academic years will be used to assess passing rates.</p>	<p>During the 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017 academic years, 4 MS students in Exercise Science specializing in Health Aspects of Physical Activity completed a comprehensive examination that included 3 questions (thesis students) or 6 questions (project students). Of the 4 students, 4 passed each question with a score of 5 or higher on the first attempt. Therefore, 100% of students passed the comprehensive exam on the first attempt, meeting this criterion.</p>	<p>The MS program was revised to eliminate concentrations and the plan for 2017-2018 is being revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Measure 1: Percent of students taking EXSC 700 who achieved a B or better on their paper.</p> <p>Spring 2018: 100% Spring 2019: 100%</p> <p>Measure 2: Percent of students passing associated questions on the comp exam on their first attempt.</p> <p>AY2017-18: no students took the comp exam AY2018-19: 2 of 4 (50%)</p> <p>Criterion for measure 1 was met. Criterion for measure 2 was not.</p>	<p>For students who are below average on admission criteria, the committee will consider offering conditional admittance for the first semester and students must obtain a B or better in first semester coursework prior to being fully admitted.</p>	<p>In addition, the committee is considering a revision to the MS curriculum which would make this course an elective instead of a required course for all students. That change would allow students to select electives to meet their professional interests.</p>	<p>< MS Exercise Science 16-17 report></p> <p>< MS Exercise Science Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: BA Art Studio</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO1 Students must possess the technical skills, perceptual development, and understanding of principles of visual organization sufficient to achieve basic visual communication and expression in multiple media.</p>	<p>Portfolio Review of 200-level Coursework. Each year, the Studio Area will appoint a committee of three faculty members to assess a representative sample of ten third- or fourth-year BA student art portfolios that contain artwork from at least three 200-level classes. Work items to be reviewed include a sample of artworks from at least three 200-level classes that reflect a range of 2-dimensional and 3-dimensional visual art projects.</p>	<p>The Spring 2017 review of the overall BA degree included reviewing a random sample of six (6) BA student comprehensive portfolios to assure that work is strong, well crafted, and demonstrates a clear understanding of basic principles of visual organization, drawing, design, color, and concepts; the ability to work with visual elements in two and three dimensional media and formats; and the ability to apply them to a specific aesthetic intent. We intend to expand the sample size to 10 or more in 2017-2018. The six portfolios that were reviewed met these expectations</p>	<p>We intend to expand the sample size to 10 or more in 2017-2018. Art Studio will continue to refine our BA assessment for 2017-2018, based on the 10-year assessment by NASAD.</p>	<p>Examination of sample portfolios found them satisfactory; work samples demonstrated that students are acquiring technical competencies across a range of studio disciplines.</p>	<p>The assessment process will be refined as we go forward with the newly-revised BA curriculum, which was developed in 2018-2019 by the SVAD Art Studio faculty in consultation with NASAD and the College of Arts and Sciences, and will go into effect in Fall 2020. Students will continue to be expected to demonstrate proficiency of technical and conceptual skills across a range of visual art mediums and practices.</p>	<p>It is important to add here that in terms of the language of Goal 2, SVAD has undertaken extensive extracurricular, and curricular, improvement in the area of Student Professional Development in AY 2018-2019 and 19-20. We have instituted a professional development seminar series for all undergraduates, which meets monthly throughout the year, and includes professional presentations by faculty and alumni on topics that include resume development, job search strategies, exhibition preparation, website development and branding, artist statements, and other professional practices. In Spring 2020, Art Business ARTS 501 will be offered as an elective course. All disciplines continue to promote internship opportunities for students as a way to gain professional experience. Graphic Design leads in this area, and other areas are increasing efforts by working with Handshake and other networking platforms.</p>	<p>< BA Art Studio 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Art Studio Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: BS Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BS)</p>	<p>Goal 3: LO1 Students will communicate effectively orally and in writing about biochemical concepts, problems, and solutions.</p>	<p>At least 80% of Students will perform at a satisfactory level or higher on the following dimensions on selected lab reports in CHEM 541L.</p> <p>At least 80% of Students will perform at a satisfactory level or higher on the following dimensions on selected oral reports in CHEM 545.</p>	<p>Overall an average of 99% of students achieved at least a satisfactory rating for this Learning Outcome. An update will be included in the 2017-2018 report after collecting and analyzing more data.</p>	<p>Students are performing as anticipated and no curriculum adjustments are recommended at this time, however, low performance aims are of interest and will be assessed further. The difference in performance between Fall and Spring is of notice and will be examined further. An update of this report as well as 2016-2017 data currently being collected will be included in the 2017-2018 report.</p>	<p>Percent of students scoring satisfactory overall (Score of 2 or higher) Fall 2017 – 83% Spring 2018 – 89% Fall 2018 – 85% Spring 2019 – 95%</p>	<p>After evaluating Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 there is still a difference in the % satisfactory between Fall and Spring with Spring being consistently higher. Fall 2018 scores are slightly higher than Fall 2017 which could be attributed to the added instruction provided based on Fall 2017 assessment.</p>	<p>After evaluating the data for FALL 2017 some changes were made to provide more detailed instruction on data analysis as applied to physical chemistry experiments in the laboratory. After the SPRING 2018 data we noticed a difference between Fall and Spring % satisfactory scores (less significant than Goals 1 and 2.</p> <p>We hypothesized that the Fall semester students were taking physical chemistry laboratory for the first time whereas spring students could have completed the CHEM 542L-physical chemistry laboratory in the fall which would have given them more instruction/practice for data analysis. In addition, the added instruction provided could have made a difference.</p> <p>Moving forward we will continue to monitor CHEM 541L, which is common to all majors in our department, as an assessment indicator. We will develop a plan to take into consideration the order in which a student takes the two physical chemistry labs.</p>	<p>< BS Biochemistry & Molecular Biology 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BS Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Cycle 1 Report></p>
--	---	---	--	---	--	---	--	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Sciences Program: BA in Comparative Literature	Goal 5: LO1 Students will demonstrate skills in basic research methods.	Seniors write a thesis in which they synthesize previous knowledge and demonstrate the ability to do independent research.	0 out 3 of the current CPLT BA students was writing a senior thesis during the 2016-2017 Academic Year.	<p>The success stories of former CPLT students can be shared with new and prospective students. In addition, the assessment results can be shared with the CPLT faculty, who should be encouraged to help students to identify research interests, establish feasible projects, and take advantage of the rich resources available at USC.</p> <p>The assessment methods only mention coursework and senior theses as potential areas where we assess students' research skills. As students' Magellan projects (or comparable research projects offered through similar programs offered at USC) are an excellent window into this outcome, next year's assessment plan can be revised to include such programs.</p>	During the Fall 2017-Fall 2019 assessment period, there were a total of two students who took and completed CPLT 499 “Senior Thesis,” one in Spring 2018, the other in Spring 2019. We consider this learning outcome has been successfully achieved for the following reasons:	In the future, we should encourage CPLT faculty to familiarize themselves with undergraduate research opportunities across campus to see if their thesis students could further enhance their research skills by getting actively involved in some of these programs (Magellan and/or GLD-research, for example).	We have been sharing the success stories with our current pre-thesis students, who were made aware that CPLT 499 could be combined with their other research pursuits, for instance, GLD-research. Based on our experience with these two successful cases, we have also been encouraging our advisees to secure a thesis advisor as early as possible, reminding them that it will be too late to start finding an advisor in the last semester, when they are required to enroll in CPLT 499	< BA Comp. Lit 16-17 Report> < BA Comp. Lit Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: PhD in Comparative Literature</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO2 Students will develop advanced linguistic competence in at least one foreign language.</p>	<p>Qualifying and Comprehensive exams. (Pass)</p> <p>Student competency in the foreign language is thus measured based on oral discussion of literary texts in the target language (both in classes and in the oral section of the comprehensive exam) and on written performance (both in student research papers written in the target language and in the written sections of the qualifying and comprehensive exams).</p>	<p>Our assessment is that this learning outcome was met.</p> <p>In Spring 2017, one student failed her French language test. Fortunately, the situation was able to be remedied as the student was advised to take GERM 615 in the summer (result pending). Passing the course would enable her to fulfill the second foreign language requirement.</p>	<p>Students need enough courses to take in their first foreign language not only to enhance their competency in that language, but also to receive adequate training in that literary tradition.</p> <p>For instance, an Asian literature course, which examines multiple non-Western traditions in transnational context, has been scheduled for Fall 2017.</p>	<p>Students’ academic records show that all students successfully met this learning outcome.</p>	<p>The good results observed in this cycle were clearly linked to the measures. We will continue to monitor the results linked to this learning outcome, and will continue to closely with individual LLC programs to make sure we will continue to be able to offer a good variety of courses for our students to take.</p>	<p>We pointed out in the report for the 2016-2017 assessment cycle that students sometimes faced the problem of not having enough courses to take in their first languages, particularly Chinese and Russian. We are happy to report that the results from the 2016-2017 cycle were used to actively address the problem. For the Fall 2017-Fall 2019 period, more graduate-level courses in Chinese and Russian literatures were offered, and the inclusion of 500-level Chinese and Russian courses proved to be particularly effective in solving the problem.</p>	<p>< PhD in Comparative Literature Assessment 16-17 report></p> <p>< PhD in Comparative Literature Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Sciences Program: BA German	Goal 1: LO2 Students will demonstrate advanced proficiency in understanding the written word.	We use the results of a reading comprehension exercise in an advanced German language class (GERM 410 or 411) to evaluate our majors' proficiency in understanding the written word.	Three of five students performed excellently on the reading comprehension exam. One was average and one below average.	The most important skills here are vocabulary and grammar. It is presumed that students who have had GERM 340: Reading Literary Texts and GERM 410: Advanced grammar will do better on this test. GERM 340 is not currently a required course, but German faculty have voted to make it a required course.	Seven out of nine majors scored 80% or higher on reading comp exercise given in GERM 411. Two scored between 60% and 70%. The results correspond to intermediate high for most students	The results are good, but not as high as for listening comprehension. Texts from various media on current events are read in this course, but it is reading is not the main focus in GERM 411: Advanced German Conversation. At present language courses, in general and in our program, tend to focus more on speaking and listening than reading (and writing). It will be suggested that the reading assessment be given at the end the 400 level literature course.	There has been an attempt in our program to assign more readings in the first three years of German to help bring them up to the advanced level. Even more should be included, but these courses need to focus on all four skills: listening, speaking, reading, writing. Reading is a focus in the two required literature courses: GERM 340 and 400 level literature sequence (one required), which students have not necessarily taken before GERM 411.	< BA German 16-17 Report> < BA German Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of "Closing the Loop" -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Sciences Program: BA German	Goal 2: LO2 Students will demonstrate intermediate to advanced level of proficiency in speaking German, i.e. express a wide range of needs, experiences, and ideas in German.	GERM 411 is our "Advanced German Language Practice" course. It emphasizes oral/aural skills, is required for majors, and is offered every year. A standardized rubric is used to evaluate the oral exams at the end of that course for assessment purposes. We will use the same (ACTFL-based) rubric each time this course is taught, and will compare results on an ongoing basis.	Four of five students had a very good or excellent overall score on the oral exam. Four of five students scored very good or excellent in the production skills of content and pronunciation, while scores in vocabulary and grammatical accuracy were somewhat lower.	Lower scores in grammatical accuracy and vocabulary may indicate a need for additional work in these areas, before students reach GERM 411. Three of the five students, who took the test, have taken advanced grammar (GERM 410), while two had not. Vocabulary is a focus in GERM 340 and 400 level literature classes. None of these courses are currently prerequisites for GERM 410, but GERM 340 will soon be required.	Seven of nine majors scored above 88% or above on the rubric (5/6 of which focuses on speaking) used for the oral interview given at the end of GERM 411. The remaining two scored between 70 and 80%. These results correspond to intermediate high or above for most of the students.	While it is to be expected that listening comprehension outpaces acquisition of speaking skills, addition practice can be prescribed for students who are lagging behind.	These results are not quite as high as the listening comprehension results, but still higher than the results for reading comprehension. Study abroad is the best way to improve speaking skills.	< BA German 16-17 Report> < BA German Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: BA Environmental Studies</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO1 Students will be able to utilize information from more than one discipline related to environmental studies, and be able to synthesize that information to analyze interdisciplinary environmental problems.</p>	<p>Eighty percent of the students will be able to demonstrate that they are proficient at developing either a research plan that will include all of the necessary components, such as presenting a hypothesis, outlining methodology, discussing data or research evaluation and synthesis of the data to form a conclusion or proficient at constructing a well written policy brief which includes the necessary components such as background, objectives, methodology, data or research discussion and evaluation to form a conclusion. Students will be judged based on a mastery, excellence, proficiency, competency or not proficient.</p>	<p>Of the 40 students in the class 24 or 60% demonstrated mastery in presenting the hypothesis, outlining methodology, discussing data, and forming conclusions, while 15 or 37.5% performed at the excellence and 2.5% were deemed to be not proficient. Therefore, 97.5% demonstrated this learning goal at the proficiency or better level.</p>	<p>We are most encouraged that 60% of the students mastered the goal of demonstrating knowledge of inquiry and research methods this year in ENVR 590. With more practice, they may be better equipped to develop more complete research plans and exhibit mastery at an earlier stage of their degree.</p>	<p>Approximately one-half were assessed as excellent and the other one-half as Proficient; none were assessed to have mastery of this learning outcome.</p>	<p>No other actions are proposed at this time.</p>	<p>Reviewing this data with time will allow us to determine whether this is indicative of general student performance and the undergraduate committee and program faculty will continue to evaluate our students and strive for increased percentages of our students at the mastery and excellence level of understanding.</p>	<p>< BA Env Stud. 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Env. Stud. Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: BA Environmental Studies</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO1 Students will be able to utilize information from more than one discipline related to environmental studies, and be able to synthesize that information to analyze interdisciplinary environmental problems.</p>	<p>Eighty percent of the students will be able to demonstrate that they are proficient at developing either a research plan that will include all of the necessary components, such as presenting a hypothesis, outlining methodology, discussing data or research evaluation and synthesis of the data to form a conclusion or proficient at constructing a well written policy brief which includes the necessary components such as background, objectives, methodology, data or research discussion and evaluation to form a conclusion. Students will be judged based on a mastery, excellence, proficiency, competency or not proficient.</p>	<p>Of the 40 students in the class 24 or 60% demonstrated mastery in presenting the hypothesis, outlining methodology, discussing data, and forming conclusions, while 15 or 37.5% performed at the excellence and 2.5% were deemed to be not proficient. Therefore, 97.5% demonstrated this learning goal at the proficiency or better level.</p>	<p>We are most encouraged that 60% of the students mastered the goal of demonstrating knowledge of inquiry and research methods this year in ENVR 590. With more practice, they may be better equipped to develop more complete research plans and exhibit mastery at an earlier stage of their degree.</p>	<p>Approximately one-half were assessed as excellent and the other one-half as Proficient; none were assessed to have mastery of this learning outcome.</p>	<p>No other actions are proposed at this time.</p>	<p>Reviewing this data with time will allow us to determine whether this is indicative of general student performance and the undergraduate committee and program faculty will continue to evaluate our students and strive for increased percentages of our students at the mastery and excellence level of understanding.</p>	<p>< BA Env Stud. 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Env. Stud. Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: BA Environmental Studies</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO1 Students will be able to utilize information from more than one discipline related to environmental studies, and be able to synthesize that information to analyze interdisciplinary environmental problems.</p>	<p>Eighty percent of the students will be able to demonstrate that they are proficient at developing either a research plan that will include all of the necessary components, such as presenting a hypothesis, outlining methodology, discussing data or research evaluation and synthesis of the data to form a conclusion or proficient at constructing a well written policy brief which includes the necessary components such as background, objectives, methodology, data or research discussion and evaluation to form a conclusion. Students will be judged based on a mastery, excellence, proficiency, competency or not proficient.</p>	<p>Of the 40 students in the class 24 or 60% demonstrated mastery in presenting the hypothesis, outlining methodology, discussing data, and forming conclusions, while 15 or 37.5% performed at the excellence and 2.5% were deemed to be not proficient. Therefore, 97.5% demonstrated this learning goal at the proficiency or better level.</p>	<p>We are most encouraged that 60% of the students mastered the goal of demonstrating knowledge of inquiry and research methods this year in ENVR 590. With more practice, they may be better equipped to develop more complete research plans and exhibit mastery at an earlier stage of their degree.</p>	<p>Approximately one-half were assessed as excellent and the other one-half as Proficient; none were assessed to have mastery of this learning outcome.</p>	<p>No other actions are proposed at this time.</p>	<p>Reviewing this data with time will allow us to determine whether this is indicative of general student performance and the undergraduate committee and program faculty will continue to evaluate our students and strive for increased percentages of our students at the mastery and excellence level of understanding.</p>	<p>< BA Env Stud. 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Env. Stud. Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: BA Film and Media Studies</p>	<p>Goal 3: LO1 Students will be able to distinguish various critical and theoretical models for analyzing moving image media and apply such models in their analysis of media texts and practices.</p>	<p>In FILM 473 all students write analytical papers that require them to distinguish, engage with and apply distinct critical and theoretical paradigms in the discipline. Papers in other upper-level courses also frequently do the same. The program expects that the majority of the majors sampled (more than 70%) should meet this learning outcome.</p>	<p>Eighty-eight percent of majors in FAMS 473 and 90% of majors in 500 level courses placing a high or medium emphasis on this outcome met or exceeded it; thus, we exceeded our target.</p>	<p>While not necessarily a cause for concern, the variety of assignments used to assess this outcome as well as the variance in how 500 level topics classes weight it is something our faculty should discuss. In our curricular plan for AY18-19, we intend to replace FAMS 473 with a more introductory course. We will reexamine this learning outcome in that context to ensure its alignment with our curriculum.</p>	<p>Fall 2018: 66% scored as excellent on this learning outcome.</p> <p>Spring 2019: All students were considered adequate or excellent on this learning outcome.</p>	<p>The majority of students surveyed across Fall 2018 and spring 2019 meet this learning outcome.</p>	<p>It is a longstanding observation of the faculty that some majors struggle initially in FAMS 240 and require more concentrated assistance and practice to be able to successfully apply theoretical concepts to the analysis of moving image media. In addition to continuing this assessment in FAMS 240, the FAMS faculty might survey this learning outcome in a mid or upper-level course in the future to determine if majors strengthen this skill over time; FAMS 240 is an introductory course and for many it is the first time they've encountered these concepts.</p>	<p>< BA FAMS 16-17 report></p> <p>< BA FAMS Cycle 1 report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Sciences Program: BA Film and Media Studies	Goal 3: LO1 Students will be able to distinguish various critical and theoretical models for analyzing moving image media and apply such models in their analysis of media texts and practices.	In FILM 473 all students write analytical papers that require them to distinguish, engage with and apply distinct critical and theoretical paradigms in the discipline. Papers in other upper-level courses also frequently do the same. The program expects that the majority of the majors sampled (more than 70%) should meet this learning outcome.	Eighty-eight percent of majors in FAMS 473 and 90% of majors in 500 level courses placing a high or medium emphasis on this outcome met or exceeded it; thus, we exceeded our target.	While not necessarily a cause for concern, the variety of assignments used to assess this outcome as well as the variance in how 500 level topics classes weight it is something our faculty should discuss. In our curricular plan for AY18-19, we intend to replace FAMS 473 with a more introductory course. We will reexamine this learning outcome in that context to ensure its alignment with our curriculum.	Fall 2018: 66% scored as excellent on this learning outcome. Spring 2019: All students were considered adequate or excellent on this learning outcome.	The majority of students surveyed across Fall 2018 and spring 2019 meet this learning outcome.	It is a longstanding observation of the faculty that some majors struggle initially in FAMS 240 and require more concentrated assistance and practice to be able to successfully apply theoretical concepts to the analysis of moving image media. In addition to continuing this assessment in FAMS 240, the FAMS faculty might survey this learning outcome in a mid or upper-level course in the future to determine if majors strengthen this skill over time; FAMS 240 is an introductory course and for many it is the first time they've encountered these concepts.	< BA FAMS 16-17 report> < BA FAMS Cycle 1 report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Sciences Program: BS Geological Sciences	Goal 2: LO1 Students will demonstrate knowledge of geological field skills by demonstrating a competency at the proficiency level on a geologic mapping exercise, preferably the Sheep Mountain project, in GEOL500.	All Geological Science students who take GEOL500 will demonstrate proficiency in the completion of the Sheep Mountain project (preferably, but other projects may be substituted) and 50% of all students who complete the Sheep Mountain project in GEOL500 will demonstrate an excellent level of knowledge.	Seventeen USC students were enrolled in GEOL 500 in Spring/Summer 2016. Thirteen of the 17 students achieved at least the Proficiency level of knowledge in the 2016 iteration of the Sheep Mountain mapping exercise per the Methods of assessment. While only 76% of students were determined to be at the Proficient level or above and did not meet the goal of 100%, nearly 50% were at the excellence level (47%).	We will also use these results to consider ways in which we can improve student mastery of field mapping.	Twelve USC students were enrolled in GEOL 498 (All twelve students achieved at least the Proficiency level of knowledge in the 2018 iteration of the Sheep Mountain mapping exercise per the Methods of assessment. Of those twelve, three students achieved the Excellent level of knowledge; and none achieved the Mastery level of knowledge.	We will use these and previous years' data for comparative purposes as we transition to a new field camp model starting in Summer 2019, which will include new map projects.	We will use these and previous years' data for comparative purposes as we transition to a new field camp model starting in Summer 2019, which will include new map projects.	< BS Geological Sciences 16-17 Report > < BS Geological Sciences Cycle 1 Report >

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Sciences Program: MS Geological Sciences	Goal 1: LO3 Students will demonstrate their proficiency in the use of laboratory, computational and field equipment and have problem-solving skills.	Eighty percent of all students admitted into the MS program will successfully complete a research project and write and publicly defend a thesis under the supervision of their major professor and thesis committee.	One hundred percent of our defending students has exceeded the program benchmark.	We will use these data to continue to encourage incoming MS students to pursue similarly successful trajectories to completion.	MS Thesis survey results for each of the ten (10) students earning an MS degree during this academic year averaged 3.30 or above for all questions in the survey. However, two (2) students failed to meet the program's benchmark of an average of 3.00 or greater for all answers in the survey, while the remaining eight individuals exceeded the benchmark (80%). Based on this result, 80% of our defending students and, therefore, we have met our program benchmark of 80%.	We will use these data to continue to encourage all incoming MS students to pursue similarly successful trajectories to completion and to improve our goal of 100% compliance.	Our rate of successful thesis proposals is a strong indicator that we are preparing our MS students effectively for careers and/or future education. We have improved our return rate of Assessment Survey forms to full compliance. Our scores overall are 3.17 out of 4, above our benchmark indicating that we are meeting our goals. We will encourage our MS students to pursue a course of study that will lead to degree completion within 2 years.	< MS Geol. Sci 16-17 report> < MS Geol. Sci. Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Science Program: BS Marine Science	Goal 3: LO2 Students will communicate and summarize their research findings effectively in writing (such as on a poster or in an abstract) on Marine Science topics.	After faculty review, greater than 25% of the senior class will submit a poster or submit an abstract to a scientific meeting or conference.	Fifty-one percent of graduating seniors created posters for research communication.	We will attempt to work with the undergraduate committee to improve ways of measuring this learning outcome.	Of the students in MSCI 311, 93.9% were assessed as Competent, and 84.1% were evaluated at the Proficiency level or above.	We evaluated the competency level of knowledge by determining the percentage of students who effectively communicate through written communications performed at various competency levels. MSCI 311, Biology of Marine Organisms, is a required course in Marine Science, and a written laboratory report within this course was used primarily as a means to evaluate the student's competency level for this learning outcome.	In as much as students in this course are usually sophomores or juniors, we are pleased with the writing ability demonstrated by the students in this class compared to prior assessment reports. The Undergraduate Committee and program faculty will continue to evaluate our students and strive for continued higher percentages of our students at the proficiency or greater level of effective written communication.	< BS Marine Science 16-17 Report> < BS Marine Science Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of "Closing the Loop" -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Sciences Program: Master of Earth and Environmental Resources Management (MEERM)	Goal 2: LO2 All students must demonstrate that they comprehend and can apply the integrated concepts developed within the courses completed by successfully completing a writing which indicates their proficiency in this integration.	Students in the program are required to enroll in two MEERM seminars and writings are required in each. Students in the internship option are also required to complete a deliverable; usually a written work product. To evaluate whether students possess the understanding required, papers will be randomly selected for review by a faculty committee.	All writings successfully indicated proficiency and all seven substantially exceeded the proficiency required.	The results indicate that most students are completing the MEERM program with an ability to integrate various concepts related to environmental concerns. Such integration can be promoted not only in the classroom but by faculty interaction and will be promoted during orientation.	Three (3) MEERM degree candidates defended and completed their degrees during the 2017-2018 academic year. After the three defenses, the student's committees submitted an assessment survey that contained two questions relevant to our progress in LO2: "The student demonstrated an adequate understanding of the interrelationships between the earth and environmental sciences, and business, policy and environmental concepts ..." in and beyond their areas of specialization, respectively. These two questions were scored on a 4-point scale, and the averages across these two questions was 3.54 out of 4.00.	We interpret this high score as indicative of the integrative abilities of the student as evidenced by a thorough and integrative written and oral presentation of the thesis or internship.	We will continue to promote this diversity in course offerings by including new areas of diverse coursework in the SEOE and by taking advantage of newly hired faculty and their expertise for student committees and course offerings.	< MEERM 16-17 Report> < MEERM Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science in Sociology</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Sociology majors completing the required SOCY 303 capstone course will demonstrate they understand the general sociological perspective and the uses of sociological theory, can apply critical reasoning skills to evaluating theoretical explanations, and can identify uses and limitations of major sociological research methods in evaluating theories. Majors will evidence these ability to apply these skills to the study of social issues of broad impact and interest beyond the discipline.</p>	<p>Success in this goal is indicated by the level of student performance in SOCY 303 courses required of all future sociology majors. At least 70% of students should demonstrate abilities in all three areas: theoretical understanding, critical reasoning and methodological assessment.</p>	<p>Assessment of learning outcome 1 as done through evaluation of final project papers and presentations for all students in the course covering all three criteria. Theoretical: 80% of papers received a score of good or excellent. Critical Reasoning: 100% received a score of good or excellent. No student received a less than adequate score.</p>	<p>There is intense ongoing faculty scrutiny of the new SOCY 303 course, these results will be shared with all faculty and the undergraduate director for further study. The methodological deficiencies reflected in this assessment have already been shared with faculty and resulted in several revisions of the undergraduate major requirements. First, already approved, we will no longer accept statistical requirements from outside the department, since students with a lack of statistical training in social and behavioral science context were those having methodological problems in 303. Second, not yet implemented, the faculty has moved to propose changing 303 to a purely methodological course rather than trying to achieve all capstone experiences in this one class. This proposal would then add a 500-level practicum experience, effectively dividing the methodological training and practicum across two courses. Other elective requirements would be changed to accommodate this change without increasing the total credit hours of the major. If these proposed changes are made</p>	<p>All assignments given the course specifically addressed all these criteria, including multiple choice exams and short answer components in which students were asked to apply their knowledge to sample research design case studies. 71 percent of students were rated good or excellent in all these areas of theoretical understanding, critical reasoning and methodological assessment. 14 percent did not achieve this rating largely due to attendance issues and 14 percent were rated as adequate.</p>	<p>All assignments given in the course specifically addressed all three criteria, including multiple choice exams and short answer components in which students were asked to apply their knowledge to sample research design case studies. 71 percent of students were rated good or excellent in all three areas of theoretical understanding, critical reasoning and methodological assessment. 14 percent did not achieve this rating largely due to attendance issues and 14 percent were rated adequate.</p>	<p>The course is currently being elevated to the 500-level in curricular changes and results will be used in design of that course.</p>	<p>< BA-BS Sociology 16-17 Report> < BA-BS Sociology Cycle 1 Report></p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---	--

Examples of "Closing the Loop" -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
				the assessment plan will be adjusted accordingly.				
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: PhD in Sociology</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO1 PhD students should demonstrate a breadth and depth of knowledge in the student's specialty area.</p>	<p>Success in this goal will also be measured by the combined percentage of research productions, comprehensive examinations, prospectus defenses and dissertation defenses acknowledged as outstanding in substantive area of specialization respects. Criteria for outstanding performance have been finalized and distributed to faculty, these criteria will be distributed twice each year by the GPD. Using these high ("professionally publishable") standards, success will be measured as at least 30 percent combined rating substantive performance as outstanding at these junctures in the program. (We will also informally track a desired 60-70 percent outstanding in at least one rubric measure under the notion that all students should have an area of excellence but not be expected to be outstanding in all respects.)</p>	<p>100 Percent of students completed 18 hrs of substantive coursework and area exams on time. 40 Percent of comps, defenses and dissertations were rated as outstanding in substantive knowledge of the field.</p>	<p>Results were shared with the GPD, Graduate Studies Committee and Chair for discussion. Pending revisions to the graduate program which have been approved by the faculty would also serve to increase the specificity of substantive course material for student interests and the range of substantive courses available to them. No further action was deemed necessary.</p>	<p>50 percent of students completed substantive training and comprehensive exams in a 3 year window following the MA and over a three year running average 56% of papers, specialty exams, prospectus defenses and dissertations were judged outstanding in substantive respects using criteria provided to faculty committees.</p>	<p>Assessment results were provided to the graduate program director and the graduate studies committee for use in their annual review of the graduate program and graduate students.</p>	<p>The newly implemented graduate working seminar is intended to improve the speed at which students complete these tasks. It is too soon to measure the impact of those recent changes on this outcome.</p>	<p>< Sociology PhD 16-17 Report></p> <p>< Sociology PhD Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Arts and Sciences</p> <p>Program: BS Statistics</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO2 Students will demonstrate a mastery of probability and mathematical statistics at the mathematical level of calculus and linear algebra.</p>	<p>Exams and coursework, supplemented by the students’ impressions of their knowledge as evaluated by the undergraduate student exit survey, and additional comments solicited from instructors of the statistics elective courses.</p> <p>The professor(s) of STAT 511-512-513 in each year shall be given a list of statistics majors in their course and a rubric guiding them to collect examples of the students work that highlights the strengths and weaknesses of that cohort of student.</p>	<p>The STAT 511/512 instructor for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 noted that some statistics majors lacked the facility with calculus to be very successful in these probability and mathematical statistics courses. Some also were unprepared in general for taking a theoretical, highly mathematical course.</p> <p>The (separate) STAT 513 instructor for Fall 2016 noted overall good results, but weaknesses on the second test, which involved deriving hypothesis tests, a very math-heavy topic with lots of manipulations involving algebra, exponents/logarithms, and calculus. The other weak point noted was a derivation of a least-squares estimator in a non-standard model.</p>	<p>A good goal for 2017-2018 is to examine the backgrounds of the students who did poorly in STAT 511. When did these students take calculus, and what were their calculus grades?</p> <p>Task: Investigate the connection between calculus preparation/grades, and success (or lack thereof) in the STAT 511-512-513 sequence. Use available data and statistical methods to come up with data-based conclusions.</p>	<p>Instructors for the STAT 511-512-513 sequence for Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 reported that statistics majors did roughly as well as the regular students in these courses. One of the instructors noted that the mathematical skills of the students is relatively weak, with basic skills like algebra and calculus on the decline.</p>	<p>One suggestion is to encourage our students to retake Calculus 1 and 2 at USC even if they have AP credit, especially the weaker students.</p> <p>Remedies for the calculus weakness and overall lack of mathematical maturity are difficult to come by in practice.</p>	<p>The deeper study of the relationship between calculus scores and STAT 511 success could shed light onto whether these remedies are sensible.</p>	<p>< BS Statistics 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BS Statistics Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Arts and Science Program: PhD in Statistics	Goal 1: LO4 Doctoral students should complete all required coursework, pass the qualifying exam at the Ph.D. level, then propose, write, and defend their dissertation in a timely manner.	Information on the time from admittance into the program to defense of the dissertation will be compiled for each student, including those that ultimately do not finish (i.e. are all-but-dissertation, or ABD). At least 80% of students admitted with at most a bachelors degree should finish within 5 years; at least 80% of students admitted with a masters degree in statistics should finish within 4 years.	For academic year 2016-2017, we have an 8th year student continuing in the program. Two 7th year students withdrew from the program without defending a proposal, while one 7th year student returned to campus to defend his thesis. Five 6th year students will complete their thesis by Summer 2017, while one continues in the program while working full-time. One fifth-year student will graduate this academic year, while another needs to identify a new advisor. One 4th year student will graduate this year.	In general, we do not come close to our goal of a median time to graduation of 5 years for incoming bachelor’s students and 4 years for incoming MS students. Attrition is low, and even students who leave USC for work meet with some success so long as they defend their proposal before they depart. At our retreat, we asked the graduate committee to review policies for the proposal defense and our dissertation preparation courses to ensure forward progress on students’ theses.	For academic year 2019-2020, we have one 7th year student and one 6th year student continuing in the program. Both of them are expected to graduate in May 2020. Among the 4 5th year students, 3 of them are known to graduate in May 2020 at this point. Two 4th year students are also expecting to graduate in May 2020.	The department enforced the following policies: (1) we have restricted our financial support to be 5 years for PhD students; (2) restrict the times of attempts of qualifier exam to be 2 times; students failing the qualifier exam twice will have to leave the program (with possibly a MS or MAS degree); (3) limit the opportunity of internship during regular semesters if the research progress is not satisfactory; (4) encourage students to start research early; and (5) reduce or discontinue financial support if student performance is not satisfactory.	The department has made progress in graduating students within 5 years in recent years.	< PhD in Statistics 16-17 Report> < PhD in Statistics Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Education</p> <p>Program: MAT Secondary Education – Social Studies</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of social studies disciplines. Candidates are knowledgeable of disciplinary concepts, facts, and tools; structures of inquiry; and forms of representation.</p>	<p>Praxis State Licensure Exam- 80% pass rate</p>	<p>Overall, 80% of students successfully pass the Praxis. M.A.T. students perform slightly better than M.T. Our goal is to have 100% of students successfully pass Praxis before completing the program.</p>	<p>Beginning in the summer 2018, an assignment was designed and given to students in the MT and MAT program.</p> <p>The assignment requires students to take the Praxis II (Content) and then design a study plan for strengthening their performance.</p>	<p>In 2019, 100% of program candidates passed the required licensure exams (Praxis II Social Studies Content & Interpretation & PLT).</p> <p>MAT students struggled the most with the behavioral sciences followed by geography. The average score on the PLT demonstrated a marginal decline between 2018 and 2019 (184 in 2018 to 181 in 2019) candidates. The strength of the MAT program is in US History, World History and Government/Civics.</p>	<p>Spring 2019 data on Praxis State Licensure Exams for these students will be compared to previous years to determine if this was effective intervention in improving scores.</p> <p>Having the data sooner would inform program advising and selection of graduate content area courses to support student’s mastery of content. This assessment activity aligns with the program SPA (National Council for the Social Studies) standards for educator preparation programs and serves as important measure of student content knowledge.</p>	<p>Students have consistently met, and in most cases exceeded, the program goals of 80% passage on the licensure exam. During the fall of 2019, faculty have met with college of arts and sciences faculty in history and geography to explore ways to do this.</p> <p>In addition, workshops on economics have been incorporated into the advanced methods course on economics.</p> <p>Given the emphasis on the disciplines of civics, history, geography and economics, we are working on ways to improve students content knowledge with an emphasis on how each discipline uses inquiry.</p>	<p>< MAT Sec. Ed. Soc. Stud. 16-17 Assessment report></p> <p>< MAT Sec. Ed. Soc. Stud. Cycle 1 Report></p>
<p>College of Education</p> <p>Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Education – Science</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Effective teachers of science understand and articulate the knowledge and practices of contemporary science. They interrelate and interpret important concepts, ideas, and applications in their fields of licensure.</p>	<p>Science Content Praxis Test State Licensure Exam</p>	<p>100% pass rate</p>	<p>Accept Praxis II scores as admission testing criteria (in addition to Miller’s and GRE). Praxis II scores are used by SPAs to measure content knowledge which can better predict success in graduate programs.</p>	<p>100% of our students passed the Praxis II content assessment</p>	<p>The program is pleased with the results, so no changes are recommended at this time.</p>	<p>The acceptance of the Praxis II as an admission test option has helped to increase the pass rate of our students on the Praxis II. The program is pleased with the results, so no changes are recommended at this time.</p>	<p>< MAT Science 16-17 Report></p> <p>< MAT Science Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Education Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Education – Science	Goal 1: LO5 Effective teachers of science provide evidence to show that P-12 students’ understanding of major science concepts, principles, theories, and laws have changed as a result of instruction by the candidate and that student knowledge is at a level of understanding beyond memorization. Candidates provide evidence for the diversity of students they teach.	Electronic Portfolio: Student Learning Sections	All students met or exceeded expectations on all elements of the portfolio in 2017. In 2018, all students met or exceeded expectations on 6 of 10 student learning portfolio elements.	Implemented 3 face-to-face meetings with all Secondary students during Fall semester to address common student teaching obstacles before the student teaching semester: classroom management, diverse learners, and assessment and project-based learning. Feedback from students during student teaching seminar and from coaching teacher and supervisor evaluations	In 2019, all students met or exceeded expectations on 9 of 10 portfolio elements.	All students met objectives for Part II of their portfolio. More focus on science specific technology and NOS within the EDSE 732 course and EDSE 585 modules is needed to improve the Part I portfolio scores.	Over the past three years, all candidates that completed the program have received acceptable or target ratings on their final Part II electronic portfolio. Unacceptable ratings on candidates’ Part I portfolios indicate that they did not collect appropriate pre-instruction and post-instruction assessments to show evidence of student learning in their first Internship A experience. Program faculty provide candidates with written feedback on each component of their Part I portfolio at the end of Internship A so that each candidate knows which areas to work on during their student teaching.	< MAT Science 16-17 Report> < MAT Science Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Education Program: Master of Arts in Teaching Secondary Education – Science	Goal 1: LO6 Effective teachers of science strive continuously to improve their knowledge and understanding of the ever-changing knowledge base of both content and science pedagogy, including approaches or addressing inequities and inclusion for all students in science. They identify with and conduct themselves as part of the science education community.	Electronic Portfolio: Science and Science Education Professionalism	All students met or exceeded expectations on all professionalism elements of the portfolio in 2017. In 2018, all students met or exceeded expectations on 3 of 5 professionalism portfolio elements.	Created/Offered EDSE 586, a 2-hour seminar to support interns during Internship II/B—substituted for EDSE 584 Course Evaluations for EDSE 584, 3-hour seminar to support interns during Spring semester, Internship II/B; students need less course meeting hours during Internship II/B as well.	In 2019, all students met or exceeded expectations on all four professionalism portfolio elements.	The program is pleased with the results, so no changes are recommended at this time.	Students are invited to local state science and mathematics conferences as well as making students aware of free local conferences (Midlands Summit, Secondary Matters) and free educational opportunities at USC. We also invite in local school district personnel to attend internship seminar orientations and as part of EDSE 585 this year we added two school visits to Brookland Cayce High School on October 4 and Westwood High School on November 1 to introduce students to educational rounds and additional professional experiences and school magnet programs.	< MAT Science 16-17 Report> < MAT Science Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Engineering and Computing</p> <p>Program: BS Biomedical Engineering</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO2 Students will be able to design and conduct laboratory experiments on living systems and their interactions with non-living systems, as well as to analyze and interpret data.</p>	<p>Laboratory reports for BMEN 260 Introduction to Biomechanics, BMEN 271 Introduction to Biomaterials, BMEN 321 Biomonitoring and Electrophysiology, BMEN 345 Anatomy and Physiology, and BMEN 361</p> <p>At least 70% of students must receive an average passing grade (“C” or higher) on the graded laboratory reports/tests for each applicable sophomore level course; 80% of students must receive an average passing grade (“C” or higher) on the graded laboratory reports/tests for junior level courses.</p> <p>Furthermore, student confidence in their ability to design and execute laboratory experiments will be evaluated with a supplemental question in student evaluations. Responses, collected on a Likert scale, must reflect an average of at least 70% student confidence in all classes.</p> <p>Finally, an exit survey of graduating seniors, administered annually, will determine the level of confidence that students have with respect to the design and execution of laboratory experiments.</p>	<p>All courses meet the criterion of 70% passing (a grade “C” or higher; sophomore level, BMEN 260) or 80% passing (a grade “C” or higher; junior level, BMEN 271, BMEN 321, BMEN 345, and BMEN 361), respectively. Within the narrow range of 86% to 100% passing of the composite laboratory student performance.</p> <p>Most courses do not meet the criterion of 70% of students expressing a high level of confidence, with the exception of BMEN 361, the last course in the curriculum sequence, suggesting that students, do increase their confidence in their ability to design and conduct laboratory experiments on living systems and their interactions with non-living systems, as well as to analyze and interpret data as they move through the curriculum. During their senior year, this confidence slightly drops again, with 70% of graduating seniors reporting a high level</p>	<p>Within open-ended questions and discussions during their senior exit interviews, some students identified the laboratory experiences and practice of technical reports as one of the strengths of the program; other students noted some disappointment with the delivery of the laboratory experience due to increased student numbers, low number of equipment, high student throughput, and lack of teaching assistants (TAs). The increasing challenges of offering laboratory components to a rapidly growing student population, particularly at the sophomore level, led the BME Undergraduate Committee to reconsider the manner in which laboratory components were administered within the curriculum in the summer and fall of 2016.</p> <p>In the junior-level classes that contain a laboratory component, all individual lab reports meet the criterion of 80% passing (a grade of “C” or higher), hence exceeding the criterion of 80% passing (a grade “C” or higher) in regard to the composite report grade.</p> <p>Most courses do not meet the criterion of 70% of students expressing a high level of confidence, with the</p>	<p>In Spring 2018, 100% of students received a grade of B or higher for their design solutions; in Spring 2019, 92% of students received a grade of B or higher. In both years, the criterion of 90% or more of students receiving a grade of A or B in their final design report was met.</p> <p>However, both indirect as well as direct assessment indicate that there is opportunity for improvement within LO 2.</p> <p>Student-confidence levels, was below the expected levels for five out of eleven recorded surveys. Upon graduation, 71.2% of seniors felt very confident in their ability to design apply engineering design in May of 2018.</p>	<p>The Assessment Committee suggested incorporating some additional lectures at the beginning of the BMEN 427 semester reiterating some concepts of the design process such as the difference between goals and objectives and the creation of Gantt charts and decision matrices.</p> <p>Some students however wished for more help during their first semester of senior design (BMEN 427), a comment that has been brought forward to the instructor of the course.</p>	<p>In 2019, this percentage had increased to 86.3% of students. Within open-ended questions and discussions during their senior exit interviews, students noted a big learning curve in this LO during their senior capstone design sequence BMEN 427 and BMEN 428.</p> <p>Additionally, students undergoing the new curriculum will now be eased into the concept of a research proposal and experiment design through the addition of BMEN 382. The first students who will have undergone this new sequence are set to graduate May 2021.</p>	<p>< BS Biomedical Engineering 16-17 Assessment Report></p> <p>< BS Biomedical Engineering Cycle 1 Report></p>
---	---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
		<p>This will be accomplished with closed ended questions to be answered using a Likert scale, as well as open-ended questions. At least 80% of graduating seniors must respond that they have a high level of confidence in their ability to design and execute laboratory experiments.</p>	<p>of confidence in this learning outcome.</p>	<p>exception of BMEN 361, the last course in the curriculum sequence, suggesting that students, though not meeting the criterion in lower-level classes, do increase their confidence in their ability to design and conduct laboratory experiments on living systems and their interactions with non-living systems, as well as to analyze and interpret data as they move through the curriculum. During their senior year, when students are not exposed to laboratory exercises anymore, this confidence slightly drops again, with 70% of graduating seniors reporting a high level of confidence in this learning outcome.</p>				

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Engineering and Computing Program: ME/MS Electrical Engineering	Goal 1: LO1 Become a specialist in a subdiscipline.	Number of credit hours that are identified by the student’s advisor as being within the subdiscipline specialty of that student. A student will be categorized as “highly specialized” if the number of hours earned equals or exceeds 18, “specialized” if the number equals or exceeds 12, and “weakly specialized” if the number equals or exceeds 9. Program objectives are for 100% of the students who graduate in any running two-year period (or other duration necessary to achieve statistically-significant results) to be at least weakly specialized, at least 50% of students to be “specialized”, and at least 25% of students to be “highly specialized”.	This is a program LO that needs to be reassessed. Therefore, this LO was not assessed this year.	Learning outcome will be changed in future plan.	During this timeframe for the ME program 5 students graduated. Of those five: 1 were considered "highly specialized", 4 "specialized", and 0 "weakly specialized". Therefore, for the ME program the goals were met. All who graduated were at least specialized or higher, 80% specialized which exceeded the goal of 50% and 20% highly specialized which was just slightly below the goal of 25%.	LO changed to, “Become a specialist in a subdiscipline by successfully planning and executing a program of study in an area of interest.”	All criteria were met. No additional actions are needed.	< ME-MS Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report> < ME-MS Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Engineering and Computing Program: ME/MS Electrical Engineering	Goal 2: LO1 Ability to execute research or development in a specific area of interest.	Thesis Defense. During the Thesis Defense, the students present in oral and written form the results of their research activity. The defense is evaluated according to the following parameters: 1) Quality of the written document 2) Quality of the oral presentation 3) Technical quality of the performed work. For each category the course instructor can assign the following grades: unacceptable, good, or excellent. The outcome will be considered to be met if at least 50% of students receive a grade of excellent and a minimum of 80% of the students receive a grade of good or higher.	For ME students three graduated: 2 of the 3 (67%) were rated as Good and 1 of the 3 (33%) was rated as excellent. For the Spring MS students, 6 graduated. The Thesis committee rated 4 of the 6 (67%) as Good and 2 of the 6 as Excellent.	The rubric used during this assessment cycle was new and needs refinement in order to better determine why assessment goals are not met. The rubric provided to the MS and ME examining committees will be expanded and improved to better aid in determining the reasons for assessment outcomes. The updated rubrics will be provided to the faculty and discussed at a faculty meeting prior to the end of the Fall 2017 semester.	For this assessment for Fall 2017, Spring 2018 and Summer 2018, 7 ME students graduated: 2 of the 7 (29%) were rated as unacceptable, 3 of the 7 (42%) were rated as Good and 2 of the 7 (29%) was rated as excellent. Each result was below goal.	The rubric used during this assessment cycle is in its second year. No action needed for MS rubric.	The rubric goals for ME will be improved to better aid in determining the reasons for assessment outcomes.	< ME-MS Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report> < ME-MS Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Engineering and Computing Program: ME/MS Electrical Engineering	Goal 1: LO1 An understanding of fundamental concepts and an ability to solve problems in their major area of research.	The outcome is tested during the Qualifying Exam. The outcome will be considered achieved if 80% of the students passed in their major area of research in the Qualifying Exam (in their first attempt).	The success rate was 83% for the first attempt on questions in the major area, thus, the criteria was met.	The Qualifying Exam was in the second year of a new written format during this assessment cycle. During the course of the year the faculty met and decided to provide a new set of guidelines to help students focus on the most appropriate review material for this exam. We will meet again after the Fall 2017 Qualifying Exam to review the results and make further corrective action if needed. We have also been collecting admission testing data for our new students and will attempt to determine if this might be an indicator of less prepared students being admitted into the program.	The success rate was 82% for the first attempt on questions in the major area, thus the criteria was met.	The graduate committee is continually assessing and updating the qualifying exam as well as expanding/editing the current database of exam questions.	The graduate committee is continually assessing and updating the qualifying exam as well as expanding/editing the current database of exam questions.	< ME-MS Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report> < ME-MS Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Engineering and Computing</p> <p>Program: ME/MS Electrical Engineering</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO2 Ability to solve sophisticated engineering problems that require integration of knowledge and skills gained in multiple graduate courses.</p>	<p>The comprehensive exam requires the student demonstrate integration of knowledge acquired in two or more graduate level courses. The possible results are:</p> <p>1) Fail, if the student is not able to provide a viable solution due to lack of math or science skills or inability to integrate knowledge gained in graduate courses in the students program of study.</p> <p>2) Good, if the student encountered problems in solving the test but was not limited by his/her math or science skills and was able to successfully integrate some knowledge from at least two courses within the students program of study.</p> <p>3) Excellent, if the student demonstrates the ability to apply broader knowledge in an integrative fashion.</p> <p>All students who graduate must pass the comprehensive exam. The outcome will be considered to be met if at least 70% of the students score Good or Excellent on their first of two possible attempts.</p>	<p>For ME students 3 took the Comprehensive Exam: 2 of the 3 (67%) were rated as Good and 1 of the 3 (33%) was be rated as excellent. Therefore for ME goal was met of more than 70% scoring Good or Excellent. This was the first attempt for all 3 yielding 100% success rate for the criterion.</p> <p>For MS students 6 took the Comprehensive Exam in the Spring of 2017. Four of the 6 (67%) were rated as Good and 2 of the 6 (33%) were rated as Excellent. This was the first attempt for all 6 therefore reaching the department goal of at least 70% of students scoring Good or Excellent on their first of two possible attempts.</p>	<p>The rubric is new for evaluation of the comprehensive exam and will be reviewed for potential refinements by the graduate committee during the Fall 2017 semester.</p>	<p>For ME students 6 took the Comprehensive Exam for the first time: 2 of the 6 (33.33%) were rated as fail; 2 of the 6 (33.33%) were rated as Good and 2 of the 6 (33.33%) were be rated as excellent. The percentage of 4 of 6 receiving good or excellent was 66.66%; therefore for ME goal was not met of more than 70% scoring Good or Excellent in their first attempt. Only one ME student took 2 attempts during this time period.</p> <p>For MS students 2 took the Comprehensive Exam. Two of the 2 (100%) were rated as Excellent; therefore the goal of at least 70% of students scoring Good or Excellent on their first of two possible attempts was exceeded.</p> <p>For the ME students the goal was just slightly missed. For MS, all criteria have been met and no action is required.</p>	<p>This rubric is still in early stages (year 2). The Graduate Committee will continue to assess and update the ME rubric as needed.</p>	<p>This rubric is still in early stages (year 2). The Graduate Committee will continue to assess and update the ME rubric as needed.</p>	<p>< ME-MS Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report></p> <p>< ME-MS Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Engineering and Computing Program: PhD in Electrical Engineering	Goal 1: LO1 An understanding of fundamental concepts and an ability to solve problems in their major area of research.	The outcome is tested during the Qualifying Exam. The outcome will be considered achieved if 80% of the students passed in their major area of research in the Qualifying Exam (in their first attempt).	The success rate was 83% for the first attempt on questions in the major area, thus, the criteria was met.	During the course of the year the faculty met and decided to provide a new set of guidelines to help students focus on the most appropriate review material for this exam. We will meet again after the Fall 2017 Qualifying Exam to review the results and make further corrective action if needed. We have also been collecting admission testing data for our new students and will attempt to determine if this might be an indicator of less prepared students being admitted into the program.	The success rate was 82% for the first attempt on questions in the major area, thus the criteria was met.	The Qualifying Exam was in the second year of its new written format during this assessment cycle. The graduate committee is continually assessing and updating the qualifying exam as well as expanding/editing the current database of exam questions.	The Qualifying Exam was in the second year of its new written format during this assessment cycle. The graduate committee is continually assessing and updating the qualifying exam as well as expanding/editing the current database of exam questions.	< PhD Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report> < PhD Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Engineering and Computing Program: PhD in Electrical Engineering	Goal 1: LO3 An expertise in their specialty area that is requisite for conducting research in that area.	An expertise in their specialty area that is requisite for conducting research in that area.	<p>Within the cohort of students without an MS/ME degree, three out of three students successfully passed the PH.D. comprehensive examination within a 4 year timeframe yielding 100% success.</p> <p>Within the cohort of students with an MS/ME degree, four out of the six passed the PH.D. examination within a 3-year timeframe yielding 66% success. One student took an extra 2 years and the other an extra year to successfully pass the Ph.D. comprehensive examination.</p>	The graduate committee will review the program of study for all students not meeting the criteria to determine the reason for longer than average time to completion. Results of this review will be reported by the graduate committee to the faculty at the second Fall 2017 faculty meeting where recommendations will also be given based on the findings.	<p>During this assessment (Fall 2017, Spring 2018, Summer 2018) period there were 4 students who took the PhD Comprehensive Examination, out of whom all 4 had an MS/ME degree upon admission to the program.</p> <p>Within those 4 students that came in with a MS/ME degree, 2 passed the PhD Comprehensive Examination within a 3-year period yielding 50% success. The other students passed the exam just over 3 years but under 4. All 4 students at the time of the comprehensive exam were full time students. Therefore just missing being 100% successful.</p>	The Graduate Committee has established a rule that will be enforced, specifically this: students must complete their proposal defense (comprehensive exam) at least one year prior to defending their dissertation. (This should also help students to complete the goals in outcomes 1 and 2.)	The committee will also continue to review the programs of study for all students not meeting the criterion, to determine if there are systematic reasons for the longer-than-average completion times.	<p>< PhD Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report></p> <p>< PhD Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Engineering and Computing</p> <p>Program: PhD in Electrical Engineering</p>	<p>Goal 2: LO1 Doctoral students will demonstrate an understanding of the discovery and innovation process as it relates to electrical engineering.</p>	<p>Ph.D. students are required to prepare and successfully defend a Dissertation Proposal. In doing so the student must be able to identify a significant problem, and how to attack that problem. The student must also be able to describe the existing state of the art as the context in which their research is conducted which requires an expansive literature search and references in the dissertation proposal. We will consider the outcome reached if at least 70% of students meet the criteria.</p>	<p>During this assessment period there were 9 students who presented a dissertation proposal, out of whom 6 had an MS/ME degree upon admission to the program.</p> <p>Within the cohort of students without an MS/ME degree, three out of three students successfully presented the PH.D. Dissertation Proposal within the 4 year timeframe yielding 100% success.</p> <p>Within the cohort of students with an MS/ME degree, four out of the six passed within the 3-year timeframe yielding 66% success. One student took an extra 2 years and the other an extra year to successfully present a proposal.</p>	<p>It appears that for the cohort of students holding a Master's degree there was not an overall benefit to their ability to conduct research as compared to those without. The graduate committee will review the program of study for those students and compare it to their Master's degree transcripts in order to determine if there is a difference for students with a thesis or non-thesis Master degree. Results will be reported to the faculty in the second Fall 2017 faculty meeting.</p> <p>The literature review was not evaluated since a rubric for that was not put into place in time for this assessment report. A rubric will be developed in the first half of the Fall 2017 semester by the graduate committee for evaluation of the references appearing in the dissertation proposals.</p>	<p>During this assessment (Fall 2017, Spring 2018, and Summer 2018) period there were 4 students who presented a dissertation proposal, out of whom all 4 had an MS/ME degree upon admission to the program. Also 3 of the 4 students were full time students.</p> <p>Of the 3 full-time students that came in with a MS/ME degree, 1 successfully presented the PhD proposal within a 3-year period yielding 33% out of the full-time students. The other 2 students successfully presented the PhD proposal just over 3 years but under 4.</p> <p>The one part-time student successfully presented the proposal in over 4 years but under 5.</p>	<p>The committee will also continue to review the programs of study for all students not meeting the criterion, to determine if there are systematic reasons for the longer-than-average completion times.</p>	<p>The Graduate Committee has established a rule that will be enforced, specifically this: students must complete their proposal defense (comprehensive exam) at least one year prior to defending their dissertation. (This should also help students to complete the goals in outcomes 1 and 2.)</p>	<p>< PhD Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report></p> <p>< PhD Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Engineering and Computing Program: PhD in Electrical Engineering	Goal 2: LO2 Doctoral students will demonstrate an ability to perform research in one of the major areas of the department.	Ph.D. students are required to write and successfully defend their final dissertation. We will consider the outcome successfully achieved if 70% of the students are able to successfully defend their dissertation within 5 years if they enter the program with a BS degree, and within 4 years if they enter the program with an ME/MS degree.	During this assessment period within the cohort of students with an MS/ME degree, six out of eleven successfully defended their dissertations within the 4-year timeframe yielding 55% success. The other five students took an extra year to successfully defend. During this time period there were 2 of 2 students without a MS/ME degree that successfully defended their dissertations within the 5-year timeframe yielding 100% success.	In roughly half of the cases MS/ME degrees are not yielding a reduction in the time to completion as expected. The graduate committee will review programs of study in an attempt to determine what factors may be involved such as MS versus ME and change of focus area for the PhD relative to the MS/ME. Results of the review will be reported to the faculty during a Fall 2017 faculty meeting.	Overall, only 6 of 11 that successfully defended, were able to do it within the timeframe goal based on if they came in with a ME/MS or without a ME/MS degree. This yielded 55% success for all students regardless of full or part-time.	Faculty is currently reassessing the required duration for the current goal.	The effect of the new 1-year requirement between proposal defense (comprehensive exam) and dissertation also needs to be assessed to see if this helps meet the goals.	< PhD Electrical Engineering 16-17 Report> < PhD Electrical Engineering Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management Program: Master of Sports and Entertainment Management	Goal 3: LO1 Students will demonstrate an ability to develop and explain workable solutions to various industry problems.	On student course evaluations for each section of SPTE 760, the average (mean) student response on the item “I learned skills that can be applied in a professional setting” should be 4.0 (Agree) or above.	The average (mean) student response on the item, I learned skills that can be applied in a professional setting for SPTE 760 was 4.62.	The SPTE Department will continue to incorporate student results to make specific refinements to the SPTE graduate curriculum. A change to instructor was made after this course was taught by an instructor for the past two years. Student responses indicated that they did not feel they were learning skills that could be applied in a professional setting. The new instructor improved this metric by a full point. Further, he moved from the use of current theoretical articles as readings back to a text. He also incorporated readings from leading trade publications.	The average (mean) student response on the item, I learned skills that can be applied in a professional setting, for SPTE 760 was 4.44.	The SPTE Department will continue to incorporate student results to make specific refinements to the SPTE.	The new instructor now keeps these metrics high. Further, he incorporated a variety of cases and projects into the class requiring more advanced work.	< MSEM 16-17 Report> < MSEM Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management</p> <p>Program: PhD in Sports and Entertainment Management</p>	<p>Goal 3: LO1 Develop highly qualified educators in the field of sport and entertainment management.</p>	<p>75% of students will receive a positive peer teaching evaluation from their advisor.</p> <p>75% of students will receive a positive peer teaching evaluation from graduate faculty members in SPTE.</p>	<p>Peer teaching evaluations were not conducted by their adviser for the PhD students teaching this year.</p>	<p>The Department Chair will meet with advisers and the PhD coordinator to emphasize the importance of peer teaching evaluations of the PhD students. A reminder email will be sent both Fall and Spring semesters to PhD advisers as well so that the evaluations are not forgotten. The department chair will meet with PhD students to review their teaching evaluations and focus on areas of improvement and things done well in the classroom.</p>	<p>100% of doctoral students enrolled in the doctoral program in the 2017-2019 academic years received a positive teaching evaluation from their faculty advisor, who are required to evaluate advisees at least once per academic year. Doctoral students do not begin teaching until after their first academic year and only after they take SPTE 810 (Seminar in Sport and Entertainment Management Education). 100% of doctoral students enrolled in the doctoral program in the 2017-2019 academic years received a positive teaching evaluation from a graduate faculty member, who may or may not have included their faculty advisor.</p>	<p>Equipped with the qualitative evaluations, and coupled with the quantitative data from student evaluations, the department chair will meet with PhD students to review their teaching evaluations and focus on areas of improvement and methods that are going well in the classroom.</p>	<p>Contrary to previous assessment where peer evaluations were not available (the doctoral program was only in its third year of existence), faculty advisors and other graduate faculty have maintained consistent, annual evaluations of our doctoral students in their classes. Fourteen doctoral students have taught at least one course in the 2017-2019 academic years and all of them received positive evaluations.</p>	<p>< PhD Sport & Ent. Mgmt. 16-17 Report></p> <p>< PhD Sport & Ent. Mgmt. Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communications</p> <p>Program: BA Advertising</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO3 Demonstrate an understanding the history of journalism and mass communications, the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications and the role of journalism and mass communications in society.</p>	<p>SJMC Student Knowledge Pre-Test/Post-Test (direct measure): In previous years, the SJMC gauged student learning using a 50-item exam. The exam included questions for all six learning outcomes, including 13 items for LO3. Incoming students took it in an entry level course (JOUR 101, Mass Media & Society) then graduating seniors took the same test during their required capstone courses. Results from the two groups were then compared. Due to consistently low scores and concerns about the methodology, we eliminated the exam following the 2015/2016 school year. In the 2016/2017 academic year, we pilot-tested a new measure, deploying instead a 13-item test which students took in JOUR 101 (our Mass Media & Society course).</p>	<p>Overall, data show student learning did take place. More than one hundred students took the test in the Spring of 2017. Scores rose, on average, 15.4% from time one to time two. The mean score for all students at the end of the semester was 71.2% (n=119), above minimum expectations of 70%. The mean score for advertising majors was 71.8% (n=15). There were no significant differences by major.</p>	<p>To that end, in the 2017/2018 academic year, the assessment team plans to make several refinements to this new. First, we hope to work closely with SJMC faculty to revise the instrument to include more challenging questions, particularly for the diversity element of the test. Second, we want to be sure all elements of this test are actually taught in every section of the course. As new and different faculty members will be teaching the course in the Fall 2017 semester, it will be paramount that all academic areas are addressed equally by those faculty members. Third, instead of conducting the test through the web-based Qualtrics program, we plan to test the instrument through the University's Blackboard system, so students can see their results instantly and, perhaps, use them to prepare for final exams in their classes. Finally, we plan to make the post-test count for a grade instead of a completion assignment. Data show that many student rushed through the test because, in this pilot year, there was no penalty associated with doing poorly. Some students took fewer than 30 seconds to complete it and got 0-3 questions correct.</p>	<p>As Table LO3a reflects, the mean score for all students rose more than 20% from pre-test to post-test in 2017/2018 and even higher, by more than 33%, in the 2018/2019 academic year.</p> <p>Although advertising students under-performed on this measure in year one (scoring just 64% on the post-test), mean scores did improve in 2018/2019 (X=73.96).</p>	<p>Like other students, advertising majors struggled to properly answer diversity questions on the post-test, however.</p> <p>The assessment team plans to review all of these results with the full SJMC faculty at the first scheduled faculty meeting in Spring of 2020.</p>	<p>We are now in our third academic year administrating a 12-item test in J101. Our assessment chair has worked closely with the SJMC's full-time faculty members to develop the instrument and the assessment process. Since the Spring of 2017, we've revised the instrument and our methods for deploying it in the classroom.</p> <p>Faculty who teach this course have worked diligently to craft an instrument that adequately gauges core concepts we expect all SJMC students to know (namely history, the role of media in society, and diversity). We are concerned, however, with student results on our J101 post-test as regards Diversity questions.</p> <p>The assessment team plans to meet with faculty members who teach this course in December of 2019 to discuss item analysis and determine what might be done to enhance student performance in this area. To be sure, diversity is a key concern for the SJMC and we intend pursue the matter with due diligence.</p>	<p><BA Advertising 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Advertising Cycle 1 report></p>
---	---	--	---	---	--	---	---	--

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Journalism</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Demonstrate the ability to conduct research, gather information, write clearly and correctly and present relevant news or persuasive information at a professional level.</p>	<p>Grammar Exam (direct measure): Students enrolled in Jour 291, 70% mean score on post-test</p> <p>Internship Supervisor Evaluation (direct measure) All student scores should meet or exceed 4.0 on a five-point scale.</p> <p>Capstone Project/Portfolio Evaluation (direct measure):</p>	<p>Data show scores rose 7% from time one to time two, to an overall average score of 68%. Although all sections of JOUR 291 reported improvement in student performance, only four sections met the goal of an average of 70%. The mean score for multimedia journalism majors was 72% (n=34).</p> <p>For measures 1 (grammar exam) and 2 (internship evaluation), criteria were met. For the final measure (capstone project evaluation), criteria were not met.</p>	<p>The school’s assessment committee is also considering another, different measure for use in this class. Specifically, we are examining the idea of a writing test using a shared prompt and grading rubric for all JOUR 291 sections. Grammar would be part of the evaluation but other professional practices for style and presentation would also be included.</p>	<p>The mean score for journalism majors missed our target by two-hundredths of a percent, so officially, just shy of expectations in 2017/2018, but met expectations the following academic year. On measure 1 (grammar assessment), the LO was not met year one but was met year two.</p> <p>On measure 2 (internship evaluation), the LO was met.</p> <p>The mean score for individual variables and combined/aggregate scores, were all below 4.0. In both academic years, students struggled especially on “presents information at a professional level.” On measure LO1c (capstone projects), the LO was not met either year.</p>	<p>We plan to dig further into this and future data to determine whether more concentrated academic support is needed for this important student sub-group (transfer students).</p> <p>In order to fully “close the loop” in the assessment process, the SJMC’s assessment committee plan to share findings of this report, as well as suggestions for future changes to assessment methods, with the full SJMC faculty at a meeting in April 2020. By sharing and discussing this report, we believe the SJMC faculty can continue to work collaboratively and diligently to improve, enhance and refine our measures and methods of assessment. We remain vigilant in addressing student deficiencies.</p>	<p>In past assessment reports, it was noted that J291 instructors find it difficult to deliver sufficient, targeted instruction in standard English usage within the time allotted for the course.</p> <p>To address those concerns, in the 2017 academic year, the instructor designed and implemented a separate set of intensive, online grammar modules. A new assessment instrument (that corresponds with grammar lessons in the course’s common text) will be introduced in the Fall of 2019.</p> <p>In the Fall of 2019, a third, part-time instructor was brought in to add additional editorial support so writing could be prioritized at this curricular level. The assessment team looks forward to gathering additional data to help us put these findings into context in the future.</p>	<p>< BA Journalism16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Journalism Cycle 1 report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Journalism</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO3 Demonstrate an understanding the history of journalism and mass communications, the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications and the role of journalism and mass communications in society.</p>	<p>Internship Supervisor Evaluations (direct measure) – Minimum standard of 4.0 established by SJMC faculty.</p> <p>SJMC Student Knowledge Pre-Test/Post-Test (direct measure)</p>	<p>More than one hundred students took the test in the Spring of 2017. Scores rose, on average, 15.4% from time one to time two. The mean score for all students at the end of the semester was 71.2% (n=119), above minimum expectations of 70%. The mean score for multimedia journalism majors was 82.05% (n=3). There were no statistically significant differences by major.</p> <p>Sixty five percent of supervisors evaluated student interns on LO3. The remaining employers either did not answer for this learning outcome or selected the “not applicable” option. The mean score for all majors on this outcome was 4.63 on a five-point scale.</p> <p>The multimedia major had a mean score of 4.0 (n=1). Differences were not statistically significant.</p> <p>Therefore, criteria were met on both measures.</p>	<p>To that end, in the 2017/2018 academic year, the assessment team plans to make several refinements to this new. First, we hope to work closely with SJMC faculty to revise the instrument to include more challenging questions, particularly for the diversity element of the test. Second, we want to be sure all elements of this test are actually taught in every section of the course. As new and different faculty members will be teaching the course in the Fall 2017 semester, it will be paramount that all academic areas are addressed equally by those faculty members. Third, instead of conducting the test through the web-based Qualtrics program, we plan to test the instrument through the University’s Blackboard system, so students can see their results instantly and, perhaps, use them to prepare for final exams in their classes. Finally, we plan to make the post-test count for a grade instead of a completion assignment. Data show that many student rushed through the test because, in this pilot year, there was no penalty associated with doing poorly. Some students took fewer than 30 seconds to complete it and got 0-3 questions correct.</p>	<p>Although only three journalism students took this course in the spring of 2018 and 2019, their performance on these variables outpaced their SJMC peers (scoring 75% on the post-test in 2018 and 83.33% on the post-test in 2019). Like other students, the journalism student who took the test in 2019 struggled on diversity questions.</p> <p>Journalism majors had a mean score of 5.0, or “strongly agree” on this measure in 17/18 and 4.4 in 18/19, above the minimum standard of 4.0 set by SJMC faculty. On measure 2 (internship evaluations), the LO was met both years.</p>	<p>The entry/exit exam in J101, particularly issues surrounding the diversity questions, require further consideration. There are four diversity questions on the instrument. The assessment team plans to meet with faculty members who teach this course in December of 2019 to discuss item analysis and determine what might be done to enhance student performance in this area, be it additional instruction and/or further revision of the instrument. To be sure, diversity is a key concern for the SJMC and we intend pursue the matter with due diligence.</p>	<p>The SJMC is generally satisfied with the performance of our students on this learning outcome as demonstrated by supervisor evaluations. The assessment team plans to review all of these results with the full SJMC faculty at the first scheduled faculty meeting in Spring of 2020.</p>	<p>< BA Journalism16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Journalism Cycle 1 report></p>
---	---	--	--	---	--	---	---	--

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Journalism</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO4 Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical concepts, legal implications, considerations and practices that guide the mass media professions.</p>	<p>Internship Supervisor Evaluations are required for all students who complete an internship for course credit. Faculty members gather the reports at the end of each semester and submit those surveys to our assessment team. Survey instruments are digitized, synthesized and evaluated at year’s end.</p> <p>SJMC Student Knowledge Pre-Test/Post-Test (direct measure):</p>	<p>On measure 1 (internship evaluations), criteria were met. The multimedia journalism major scored 4.0 (n = 1).</p> <p>On measure 2, (pre/post test). Criteria were not met. The mean score for multimedia journalism majors was slightly higher, at 65.0% (n=12).</p>	<p>To that end, in the 2017/2018 academic year, the assessment team plans to make several refinements to this new. First, we hope to work closely with SJMC faculty to revise the instrument to include more challenging questions, particularly for the diversity element of the test. Second, we want to be sure all elements of this test are actually taught in every section of the course. As new and different faculty members will be teaching the course in the Fall 2017 semester, it will be paramount that all academic areas are addressed equally by those faculty members. Third, instead of conducting the test through the web-based Qualtrics program, we plan to test the instrument through the University’s Blackboard system, so students can see their results instantly and, perhaps, use them to prepare for final exams in their classes. Finally, we plan to make the post-test count for a grade instead of a completion assignment. Data show that many student rushed through the test because, in this pilot year, there was no penalty associated with doing poorly. Some students took fewer than 30 seconds to complete it and got 0-3 questions correct.</p>	<p>On measure 2 (internship evaluations), the LO was met. The mean score for journalism majors was 4.71 out of 5. In 2018/2019, that score was 4.40. Both were well above minimum expectations.</p> <p>In 2017/2018, journalism students scored approximately 68% but that number rose to 79% the following year, outpacing their SJMC peers by more than ten percentage points. On measure 1 (J303 pre/post-test), the LO was not met in year one but was met in year two.</p>	<p>Assessment data show journalism students also fare well when it comes to performance in the workplace (as witnessed and evaluated by their supervisors. All results will be shared with the full SJMC faculty in the Spring of 2020.</p> <p>Trend data on the J303 entry/exit exam show significant growth, year-over-year, on this measure for Journalism students, improving from approximately 64% in 2015/2016 to a 79% in 2018/2019. It is unclear what’s leading to this particular finding when students from other majors struggled so mightily. The assessment chair plans to meet again with the faculty members in December 2019 to discuss results and methods of deployment further. It is a continuous process of development to which the SJMC is dedicated.</p>	<p>Since the Spring of 2017, we’ve revised the instrument and our methods for deploying it in the classroom three different times – slightly amending and revising both since our pilot test.</p> <p>Overall, data show student learning is taking place. Trending from 2015 to present, mean student scores have risen significantly since we began focusing on how and when these items are measured. In 2017/2018, mean student scores rose by 18% and by more than 25% in 2018/2019. Nonetheless, scores remain below the minimum standard set by faculty for most of our majors.</p>	
---	--	--	---	---	---	--	---	--

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Mass Communication</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Demonstrate the ability to conduct research, gather information, write clearly and correctly and present relevant news or persuasive information at a professional level.</p>	<p>Grammar Exam (direct measure): Students enrolled in Jour 291, our introductory writing course that is required across majors, take a diagnostic grammar and writing exam twice during the course. It is our expectation that the mean score of the post-test should be at least 70%.</p> <p>Internship Supervisor Evaluation (direct measure): As part of our normal evaluation of interns from the school, employers are asked to assess our students’ performance on the job. It is the faculty’s expectation that student scores meet or exceed 4.0 on a five-point scale.</p> <p>Capstone Project/Portfolio Evaluation (direct measure):</p>	<p>Continued efforts are needed in regards to student performance on the diagnostic grammar exam. Sophomore-level students struggle mightily in this area. All students, regardless of major, demonstrated difficulty with subject-verb agreement (especially with collective nouns), successfully matching pronouns with their referents, and distinguishing between the nominative and objective cases for pronouns. The argument has been made that mass communication professionals no longer recognize any of these distinctions. In the future, the SJMC faculty must determine if we are to continue to hold students responsible for these points of standard usage or treat them as desirable but not essential.</p>	<p>The mean score for mass communication majors was 68% (n=13) on the grammar exam.</p> <p>Mass communications majors scored 4.5 (n = 2) on the internship supervisor evaluation.</p> <p>Although data showed student learning was taking place, scores remained low year to year – with average scores often falling below 70%. In the 2015/2016 academic year, for example, only 39% (83 of 213) of senior-level students taking the exam passed with a C or higher. 62% (130 of 213) received Ds or failed. It was unclear whether the problem was lack of student learning or the instrument/testing environment itself. After much consideration, the SJMC assessment team decided to eliminate the 50-item test.</p> <p>On measures 1 (grammar test), criteria were not met. On measure 2 (internship evaluation), criteria were met. No data was available for measure 3 for mass communication majors.</p>	<p>The mean score for mass communications majors was approximately 69% and 66% respectively over these two academic years. On measure 1 (grammar assessment), the LO was not met.</p> <p>Mass communications majors scored 4.5 and 4.8, respectively. On measure 2 (internship evaluation), the LO was met.</p> <p>Mass communications majors scored above expectations on “writes clearly” and “presents information at a professional level.” They had some challenges, however, when it came to “gathering information/conduct research” (X=3.92), scoring just below expectation. As Table LO1c reflects, the mean score for these variables, when combined into an aggregate score, was 4.06. Therefore, on this measure (capstone projects), we consider that the LO as a whole was met for the 2018/2019 academic year.</p>	<p>New in this academic cycle, we asked students if they had transferred into the program. On average, their performance was lower (64%) than the non-transfer students (70%). We plan to dig further into this and future data to determine whether more concentrated academic support is needed for this important student sub-group (transfer students).</p> <p>A new assessment instrument (that corresponds with grammar lessons in the course’s common text) will be introduced in the Fall of 2019.</p>	<p>In order to fully “close the loop” in the assessment process, the SJMC’s assessment committee plan to share findings of this report, as well as suggestions for future changes to assessment methods, with the full SJMC faculty at a meeting in April 2020. By sharing and discussing this report, we believe the SJMC faculty can continue to work collaboratively and diligently to improve, enhance and refine our measures and methods of assessment. While acknowledging that issues of student competency in writing go beyond what might be accomplished in a single course, we remain vigilant in addressing student deficiencies.</p>	<p>< BA MassComm 16-17 Report ></p> <p>< BA MassComm Cycle 1 Report ></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Mass Communication</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO4 Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical concepts, legal implications, considerations and practices that guide the mass media professions.</p>	<p>SJMC Student Knowledge Pre-Test/Post-Test (direct measure):</p> <p>Internship Supervisor Evaluations (direct measure):</p>	<p>The mean score for mass communications majors was quite a bit higher at 70.77% (n=13), but those differences were not statistically significant.</p> <p>Supervisor evaluations demonstrate that SJMC students are doing quite well on LO4 while in the workplace. Mass communications majors scored 4.5 (n = 2).</p> <p>Criteria were met for both measures.</p>	<p>To that end, in the 2017/2018 academic year, the assessment team plans to make several refinements to this new. First, we hope to work closely with SJMC faculty to revise the instrument to include more challenging questions, particularly for the diversity element of the test. Second, we want to be sure all elements of this test are actually taught in every section of the course. As new and different faculty members will be teaching the course in the Fall 2017 semester, it will be paramount that all academic areas are addressed equally by those faculty members. Third, instead of conducting the test through the web-based Qualtrics program, we plan to test the instrument through the University’s Blackboard system, so students can see their results instantly and, perhaps, use them to prepare for final exams in their classes. Finally, we plan to make the post-test count for a grade instead of a completion assignment. Data show that many student rushed through the test because, in this pilot year, there was no penalty associated with doing poorly.</p>	<p>On measure 1 (J303 pre/post-test), the LO was not met. In 2017/2018, mass communications students scored approximately 62% in 2017/218 and 65% in 2018/2019. Below where we want them to be.</p> <p>The mean score for mass communications majors was 4.25 out of 5. In 2018/2019, that score rose to 4.76. Both were well above minimum expectations. On measure 2 (internship evaluations), the LO was met.</p>	<p>All SJMC students struggle with legal concepts as measured using this particular pre/post-test design. Faculty members who teach our J303 course argue that this may not be the best method for evaluating student learning although suitable alternatives have not yet been identified. That said, faculty members are committed to teaching and measuring the same concepts across different sections of the course. The assessment chair plans to meet again with the faculty members in December 2019 to discuss results and methods of deployment further.</p>	<p>While satisfied with the performance of students in the workplace (as witnessed and evaluated by their supervisors), results of the entry/exit exam continue to be cause for concern.</p> <p>It is a continuous process of development to which the SJMC is dedicated.</p> <p>All results will be shared with the full SJMC faculty in the Spring of 2020.</p>	<p><BA Mass Comm 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Mass Comm Cycle 1 Report></p>
---	--	---	---	--	--	--	---	--

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Public Relations</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Demonstrate the ability to conduct research, gather information, write clearly and correctly and present relevant news or persuasive information at a professional level.</p>	<p>Grammar Exam (direct measure): It is our expectation that the mean score of the <i>post</i>-test should be at least 70%. Internship Supervisor Evaluation (direct measure): It is the faculty’s expectation that student scores meet or exceed 4.0 on a five-point scale.</p> <p>Capstone Project/Portfolio Evaluation</p>	<p>The mean score on the grammar exam for public relations majors was 66% (n=71).</p> <p>Public relations majors scored 4.75 (n = 52) of 5 on the internship supervisor evaluation.</p> <p>Public relations majors scored 4.132 out of 5 (n-16) on the Capstone Project/Portfolio Evaluation</p>	<p>While we are pleased with results from these two measures, continued efforts are needed in regard to student performance on the diagnostic grammar exam. Sophomore-level students struggle mightily in this area. In the future, the SJMC faculty must determine if we are to continue to hold students responsible for these points of standard usage or treat them as desirable but not essential.</p>	<p>On measure 1 (grammar assessment), the LO was not met. The mean score for public relations majors was approximately 69% in each of these two academic years, just slightly below our minimum desired score.</p> <p>On measure 2 (internship evaluation), the LO was met. PR majors scored 4.74 in 2017 and 4.66 in 2018, respectively.</p> <p>In AY 2017-2018, PR majors met expectations, achieving a mean score of 4.16 on this measure. Number fell below expectations in AY 2018-2019, however. Therefore, on measure LO1c (capstone projects), the LO was met in the first year but not met in the most recent year evaluated.</p>	<p>Continued attention must also be paid to student performance on the diagnostic grammar exam. Sophomore-level students struggle mightily in this area. For three academic cycles, our students’ scores have hovered just below minimum faculty expectations. New in this academic cycle, we asked students if they had transferred into the program. On average, their performance was lower (64%) than the non-transfer students (70%). We plan to dig further into this and future data to determine whether more concentrated academic support is needed for this important student sub-group (transfer students). A new assessment instrument will be introduced in the Fall of 2019. We also continue to consider a different measure – a writing test using a shared prompt and grading rubric for all JOUR 291 sections.</p>	<p>The PR major has grown significantly in recent years. It is the largest major in the school of journalism. The Capstone Project Evaluation adds valuable information to our examination of learning outcomes. In addition to quantitative findings included in this report, practitioners also make qualitative remarks on these projects, which we now regularly provide to faculty members in the sequence to guide further curriculum decisions.</p> <p>In order to fully “close the loop” in the assessment process, the SJMC’s assessment committee plan to share findings of this report, as well as suggestions for future changes to assessment methods, with the full SJMC faculty at a meeting in April 2020. By sharing and discussing this report, we believe the SJMC faculty can continue to work collaboratively and diligently to improve, enhance and refine our measures and methods of assessment.</p>	<p>< BA Public Relations 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Public Relations Cycle 1 Report></p>
---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Public Relations</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO3 Demonstrate an understanding the history of journalism and mass communications, the diversity of groups in a global society in relationship to communications and the role of journalism and mass communications in society.</p>	<p>Internship Supervisor Evaluations (direct measure): Mean score for all students of 70%.</p> <p>SJMC Student Knowledge Pre-Test/Post-Test (direct measure): Minimum score of 4.0 of 5.</p>	<p>For measure 1 (pre/post test), criteria were not met. The mean score for public relations majors was 69.93% (n=22).</p> <p>For measure 2 (internship evaluation), criteria were met. Public relations majors had a mean score of 4.64 (n=36) of 5.</p>	<p>The assessment team plans to make several refinements to the new entry/exit exam. First, we hope to work closely with SJMC faculty to revise the instrument to include more challenging questions, particularly for the diversity element of the test. Second, we want to be sure all elements of this test are actually taught in every section of the course. As new and different faculty members will be teaching the course in the Fall 2017 semester, it will be paramount that all academic areas are addressed equally by those faculty members. Third, instead of conducting the test through the web-based Qualtrics program, we plan to test the instrument through the University’s Blackboard system, so students can see their results instantly and, perhaps, use them to prepare for final exams in their classes. Finally, we plan to make the post-test count for a grade instead of a completion assignment. Data show that many students rushed through the test because, in this pilot year, there was no penalty associated with doing poorly. Some students took fewer than 30 seconds to complete it and got 0-3 questions correct.</p>	<p>On measure 1 (internship evaluations), the LO was met. PR majors had a mean score of 4.6 on this measure in 17/18 and 4.67 in 18/19, above the minimum standard of 4.0 set by SJMC faculty.</p> <p>PR students met faculty expectations in both academic years on the pre/pos test . As Table LO3a shows, they scored 77.33% on the post-test in year one and more than 74% in year two.</p>	<p>He entry/exit exam in J101, particularly issues surrounding the diversity questions, require further consideration. There are four diversity questions on the instrument. The assessment team plans to meet with faculty members who teach this course in December of 2019 to discuss item analysis and determine what might be done to enhance student performance in this area, be it additional instruction and/or further revision of the instrument. To be sure, diversity is a key concern for the SJMC and we intend pursue the matter with due diligence.</p> <p>The assessment team will review all of these results with the full SJMC faculty at the first scheduled faculty meeting in Spring of 2020.</p>	<p>Since the Spring of 2017, we’ve revised the instrument and our methods for deploying it in the classroom three different times – slightly amending and revising both since our pilot test. Faculty distribute the pre-test during the first two weeks of class and the post-test during the last week of the class.</p> <p>Despite the needed changes, the SJMC assessment team feels confident that this new measure improves upon the previous one and expect stronger student learning outcomes with future refinements.</p>	
---	---	--	---	--	---	---	--	--

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: BA Visual Communications</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO4 Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical concepts, legal implications, considerations and practices that guide the mass media professions.</p>	<p>Internship Supervisor Evaluations (direct measure):</p> <p>SJMC Student Knowledge Pre-Test/Post-Test (direct measure):</p>	<p>The mean score for visual communications majors was slightly higher, at 65.0% (n=18),</p> <p>Visual communications majors scored 4.83 (n = 6) of 5 overall on the internship supervisor evaluation.</p> <p>For measure 1 (internship evaluation), criteria were met. For measure 2 (pre/post test), criteria were not met.</p>	<p>First, we hope to work closely with SJMC faculty to revise the instrument to include more challenging questions, particularly for the diversity element of the test. Second, we want to be sure all elements of this test are actually taught in every section of the course. As new and different faculty members will be teaching the course in the Fall 2017 semester, it will be paramount that all academic areas are addressed equally by those faculty members. Third, instead of conducting the test through the web-based Qualtrics program, we plan to test the instrument through the University’s Blackboard system, so students can see their results instantly and, perhaps, use them to prepare for final exams in their classes. Finally, we plan to make the post-test count for a grade instead of a completion assignment. Data show that many student rushed through the test because, in this pilot year, there was no penalty associated with doing poorly. Some students took fewer than 30 seconds to complete it and got 0-3 questions correct.</p>	<p>On measure 1 (internship evaluations), the LO was met.</p> <p>The mean score for VisCom majors was 4.8 out of 5. In 2018/2019, that score was 4.5. Both were well above minimum expectations.</p> <p>On measure 2 (J303 pre/post-test), the LO was not met. N 2017/2018, VisCom students scored approximately 60% on this measure.</p>	<p>Faculty members who teach our J303 course argue that this may not be the best method for evaluating student learning although suitable alternatives have not yet been identified. The assessment chair plans to meet again with the faculty members in December 2019 to discuss results and methods of deployment further.</p> <p>All results will be shared with the full SJMC faculty in the Spring of 2020.</p>	<p>We are now in our third academic year administrating a 10-item test in our Media Law & Ethics course (JOUR 303), which is required for all majors. Our assessment chair has worked closely with the SJMC’s two full-time faculty members to develop the instrument and the assessment process. Since the Spring of 2017, we’ve revised the instrument and our methods for deploying it in the classroom three different times – slightly amending and revising both since our pilot test.</p> <p>Overall, data show student learning <i>is</i> taking place. Trending from 2015 to present, mean student scores have risen significantly since we began focusing on how and when these items are measured. In 2017/2018, mean student scores rose by 18% and by more than 25% in 2018/2019. That said, it is clear, student scores are consistently rising and faculty members are committed to teaching and measuring the same concepts across different sections of the course.</p>	<p>< BA Visual Comm 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BA Visual Comm Cycle 1 Report></p>
--	--	---	---	---	---	---	--	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: Bachelor of Science in Library Information Systems</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Students will describe the techniques and principles for creating, storing, organizing, transforming, and communicating information to various information seekers.</p>	<p>Students will , present to a faculty panel on their experience. Students will be evaluated on a rubric where 85% of all graduating students should score proficient or higher.</p>	<p>One student presented their internship experience to a faculty panel. He scored proficiently on this learning outcome.</p>	<p>The BSIS program is undergoing significant changes as it has a new faculty administrator. Some changes are reflected in next year’s plan (new goals and learning outcomes). Curriculum changes are also coming. A new rubric will be drafted to reflect the new goals and learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Fall 2017: One student graduated and presented received a score of exemplary for this learning outcome.</p> <p>Spring 2018: II 5 students were evaluated by a faculty panel and received a score of exemplary for this learning outcome.</p> <p>Summer 2018: he was independently evaluated by a faculty panel and received a score of proficient for this learning outcome.</p> <p>Fall 2018: Three students presented. All three were evaluated by a faculty panel and received a score of exemplary for this learning outcome. One student won an award for his presentation.</p> <p>Spring 2019: All 5 students were evaluated by a faculty panel and received a score of exemplary for this learning outcome.</p> <p>Fall 2019: N=4: All students were evaluated by a faculty panel and received a score of exemplary for this learning outcome.</p>	<p>These results gathered at the end of the fall semester will be reported out to faculty at the beginning of the spring term). Results are analyzed and used to identify any weaknesses or gaps in curriculum.</p>	<p>These results were used between the previous assessment report (for 2016-2017) and this report to revise the BSIS program goals and learning outcomes to what is currently listed in our assessment plan and report.</p>	<p>< BSIS LIS 16-17 Report></p> <p>< BSIS LIS Cycle 1 Report></p>
---	---	---	---	---	--	---	---	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Information and Communication</p> <p>Program: Certificate in Library & Information Science</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO3 Students will demonstrate specialized knowledge and/or skills in a specific chosen area of the field.</p>	<p>All students will submit an end-of-program portfolio that will highlight the specialized skills and knowledge gained during the Certificate program. 85% of all graduating students should score proficient or higher on the work sample submitted.</p>	<p>Two students required to complete a portfolio completed the Certificate program this year and scored exemplary on the artifact selection and reflective essay. One finished in fall 2016 and one in spring 2017.</p>	<p>A new portfolio rubric is still in draft form since so few students have completed a portfolio for this program, but feedback from faculty thus far is positive.</p>	<p>AY 17-18: One student completed the Certificate of Graduate Study The student received a score of exemplary for both the artifact and reflective essay for this learning outcome in their portfolio. Based on these results, this learning outcome was achieved.</p> <p>AY 18-19: One student completed the Certificate of Graduate Study during the 2018-2019 academic year; The student received a score of exemplary for both the artifact and reflective essay for this learning outcome in their portfolio. Based on these results, the learning outcome was achieved.</p> <p>Fall 2019: Three students completed the certificate program in Fall 2019. Two students received a score of exemplary for both the artifact and reflective essay, and one student received a score of proficient for both the artifact and reflective for this learning outcome in their portfolios. Based on these results, this learning outcome was achieved.</p>	<p>All faculty voted on and agreed to reduce the required credit hours for the certificate to 12 credit hours. This was done for two primary, related reasons: to enable students to better define their professional development goals by earning the certificate as a way of demonstrating specialized knowledge in certain area of the LIS field and to allow students to earn the certificate concurrently with the MLIS thus making their overall program of study for the CGS more focused on their specific career goals.</p>	<p>A rubric has been created for the CGS end-of-program portfolio. To this end, we have used the results from recent years to revise several aspects of our certificate program: fi The degree requirements for the certificate have also been revised to allow students to choose from one of the following capstone experiences as part of their program of study for the certificate: students must complete either one 3-hour internship, an independent study, a thesis (3 hours of thesis credit), or another capstone experience that must be approved by the student’s advisor and the Graduate Director. Our aim in making these changes is twofold: we hope this will enable and encourage more students to enroll in and complete the certificate program so that we might have a larger sample size in assessing this program. More importantly, we also hope that these changes will enable students to better define their professional development goals so they may pursue coursework that supports these goals.</p>	<p>< LIS Cert 16-17 Report></p> <p>< LIS cert Cycle 1 Report></p>
---	---	--	---	---	---	--	--	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Nursing Program: Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)	Goal 1: LO1 Provide evidence-based clinically competent care across the continuum of care.	1.85% or greater of all students will perform at a level 2 or higher on all content mastery examinations (ATI) for progression in the following courses: NURS 312, NURS 411, NURS 412, NURS 422, NURS 424, NURS 425, NURS 431. 2. Graduating seniors will perform at a level 2 on the comprehensive predictor exam prior to degree conferral. 3.85% or greater of graduates will pass the NCLEX-RN examination on the first or second attempt.	Benchmarks met in four of these courses and not met in three courses: NURS 424, 425 and 431. Final BSN program outcome measures met.	Course coordinators in the 7-week courses (NURS 424 and 425) are exploring if offering them concurrently over 14 weeks might provide more opportunity for students to absorb the content. Course coordinators will review these results and make recommendations to undergraduate council in fall of 2017. NURS 431 has been changed by increasing one credit for a clinical experience and this change will be evaluated next year.	Benchmarks met in four of these courses and not met in four courses: NURS 312, 412, 424 and 431. 100% passed the NCLEX exam on the first attempt from May and Dec 2018 graduates (May n=128; December n=68).	Course coordinators were changed for 312 & 431 this past year due to previous coordinator faculty on leave. The course coordinators for 412 & 424 are evaluating course formative evaluations for opportunities to strengthen students comfort level with heavy didactic courses. Course coordination will be approached with a team model moving forward to avoid future gaps.	The ATI remediation and tracking programs are being continued as they have resulted in a strong end of program and licensure outcome for the program graduates.	< BSN 16-17 Assessment report> < BSN Cycle 1 Report>
College of Nursing Program: Doctor of Nursing Practice	Goal 2: LO1 Demonstrate effective information literacy and management skills in analyzing the strength of evidence in the scientific literature as the basis for implementing a research utilization project or designing evidence-based protocols for advanced practice.	DNP capstone project in course (NURS 897): 85% of the students enrolled will receive satisfactory score on capstone presentation and manuscript development.	100% of the students (N= 7) in NURS 897 received a satisfactory score on DNP Clinical Project presentation. No students in current group fell under the new rule to complete a manuscript.	A new tool was approved and will begin to be used in the fall 2017.	For the Fall 2017-2019 time frame, the following results were obtained: NURS897: 95% 1 st attempt pass of the DNP project (n=23)	The current cycle results exceeded the benchmark. The plan is to continue the current course project and monitor results.	The DNP project process was updated in summer 2019 after student input regarding the process and streamlined the project steps.	< DNP 16-17 Report> < DNP Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Pharmacy Program: Pharm. D.	Goal 1 :LO1 Foundational knowledge – The graduate is able to develop, integrate, and apply knowledge from the foundational sciences (i.e., biomedical, pharmaceutical, social/behavioral/administrative, and clinical sciences) to evaluate the scientific literature, explain drug action, solve therapeutic problems, and advance population health and patient-centered care.	Licensure Exams: first attempt pass rate above the national average for NAPLEX and 95% or above first attempt pass rate on MPJE (both of these exams are administered by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and scores / pass rates are shared with the pharmacy education accreditation organization, ACPE; first pass rates at or above the national average are expected for maintenance of full accreditation status)	College passage rates of first-time candidates on the NAPLEX® and the MPJE® continue to be strong. For 2016 SCCP graduates, first attempt passing rate on the NAPLEX® was 86.78%, above the national average passing rate of 85.03%, and over the past three years, the SCCP’s NAPLEX pass rate has exceeded the national average. For 2016 SCCP graduates, the first attempt passing rate on the MPJE® was 89.12%, above the national average passing rate of 84.08%.	There is an opportunity for the Curriculum Committee to review the new Competency Statements and integrate findings into their annual curriculum review process to ensure students have the best preparation for the NAPLEX.	First time pass rates for program graduates continue to be above the national average. Over the past 3 years, NAPLEX results have improved from 86.8% to 93.3%. Results are summarized in the table below.	We have recently run correlation analysis of pre-NAPLEX to NAPLEX based on 2016 – 2018 graduates. Based on the preliminary analysis, pre-NAPLEX is noted to have a moderately positive correlation to NAPLEX performance with an R2 = 0.544. Although there is a cost associated with this practice test (\$55 per student), it continues to be a valuable tool for our students.	Performance on pre-NAPLEX may be able to help identify low-performing students who may need intensive content review in preparation for the NAPLEX. Will need to determine if other variables are performance indicators.	<insert PharmD 16-17 Assessment Report> < PharmD cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>College of Pharmacy</p> <p>Program: Pharmaceutical Sciences PhD</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Pharmaceutical Sciences doctoral graduates are expected to gain the required knowledge of theory in the core areas of pharmaceutical sciences.</p>	<p>At least 90% of students will receive a grade of B or better in each exam and project in PHAR 700. A final grade of B or higher for 90% of students is also the goal. For PHAR 700 Students will be evaluated with 5 written exams of equal weighting. There will also be a special project and presentation. Tests 1-5, 18% each. Project: 10%</p>	<p>In Spring 2017, PHAR 701 had 7 students enrolled in the course. The average for each assignment was 90% or higher except for the CNS- Neurotransmission project (79.3%) and Theragonostics (89.3%).</p>	<p>The PHAR 700 and 701 courses have run smoothly, feedback from the students was positive, and students did well on the exams. Although no changes were made, we continue to monitor the content of the courses, and will update the material as we see fit. For example, a new block focused on academia will be incorporated into PHAR 701 in the future as well as additional topics on personalized medicine.</p>	<p>In fall 2018, 7 students were enrolled in PHAR 700. The results for each assessment (5 exams and 1 project) are included in table 1 below. A total of 81% of the assessments in the course had a grade of B or better (which does not meet the overall goal of at least 90%).</p> <p>In spring 2019, 8 students were enrolled in PHAR 701. The average for each assignment was 90% or higher except for 2 of the 3 in block 3 which included Theragnostics (83.8%) and Methods to study drug resistance in cancer (85%).</p>	<p>The PHAR 700 and 701 courses have run smoothly, feedback from the students was positive, and students did well on the exams. Exam 1 in PHAR 700 continues to be challenging content with an overall average around 79.5%. There is an opportunity to discuss with the primary faculty responsible for that content to gain further insight into potential reasons for lower overall performance.</p>	<p>With the growth of personalized medicine, the additional topics on personalized medicine were timely and well received by students.</p> <p>A course coordinator change will occur in both PHAR 700 and PHAR 701 during the upcoming academic year. However, during this time the old coordinator will provide assistance during the transition. It will be important to debrief with the new and old coordinator as well as the graduate director to discuss what went well and opportunities for future improvement. Additionally, a new course evaluation system for graduate program courses will be implemented in Fall 2019 and allow additional insight into strengths of the courses and opportunities for improvement.</p> <p>Course faculty will continue to explore changes for this particular block especially as the information is rapidly changing and advancing. As this block had a lower overall performance (around 84%), will need to look at future</p>	<p>< Pharmaceutical Sciences PhD 16-17 Report></p> <p>< Pharmaceutical Sciences Cycle 1 Report></p>
--	---	--	--	--	---	---	---	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
							performance to determine how well students are archiving the course specific outcomes related to personalized medicine.	
<p>College of Social Work</p> <p>Program: Certificate in Drug and Addiction Studies</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO5 Students will be able to recognize the special needs of different groups affected by chemical addictions: women, GLBT persons, African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics, older adults, adolescents, people living in poverty, and the mentally ill chemical abuser (MICA).</p>	<p>80% of students will successfully answer related questions on the final exam.</p>	<p>There were 7 questions on the final exam that examined students understanding of the differential impacts of SUD on special populations. Students successfully answered all questions but two above the 80% threshold. Two questions fell below the 80% threshold required knowledge about obstacles that women face in the treatment of SUDs. One question asked students to identify the most prevalent obstacle (childcare), and only 75.87% answered correctly. When understanding the differences in disease progression in women compared to men only 77.59% identified women as needing treatment sooner than their male counterparts.</p>	<p>This learning outcome had the most measures; however, students fell below the 80% threshold on two questions that related specifically to women and addiction. This material is essential for all students in this course. Additional readings and attention will be paid to this issue to improve students understanding of the impact of SUD on women. Students identified the unique needs of other groups with multiple questions in the final exam.</p>	<p>90% of students successfully answered related questions on the final exam. The outcome has been met.</p>	<p>Use of Results Results are reported to the MSW Program Committee, including the Associate Dean for Curriculum and the Assistant Dean for Curriculum and Assessment. These results are used to inform quality improvement efforts within the social work curriculum, with the goal being to develop increasingly higher levels of social work practice competencies by matching classroom experiences with student learning needs. At this time, there are no immediate changes needed.</p>	<p>Needs will continue to be monitored by the leadership of the Drug and Addictions Certificate Program Coordinator and the MSW Program.</p>	<p>< Drug & Addition Certificate 16-17 Report></p> <p>< Drug & Addition Certificate Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
College of Social Work Program: Social and Behavioral health with Military Members, Veterans, and Military Families	Goal 1: LO3 Students will demonstrate knowledge of the differential impacts of military service for unique military populations.	Student grades on the Special Populations Paper and Presentation for class 738. At least 85% of students should score a B or higher on this assignment.	Students in both the summer and fall sessions met this goal. The paper and presentation was done as a group project, and all students received a grade of B or higher for this assignment.	While students did an excellent job on both the paper, and the presentation of their work, the assignment was done as a group project. Each student was responsible for presenting their part of the overall project that met the assignment requirements, it is sometimes hard to gauge individual performance. Overall, I am satisfied with their performance. I may consider expanding this criteria to include assessment date from quizzes or the other paper that is required in this particular course.	This outcome was met. A total of 37 students demonstrated an understanding of military culture by completing the competency training project in SOWK 738. A score of B or higher was obtained for 100% of the student assessed. Student performance on this assessment demonstrates an understanding of the unique aspects of military culture for generalist social work practice.	These results will be used to inform curricular updates and modifications to the certificate program.	A subcommittee has been formed to update curricular content and syllabi for the military certificate. Results from this assessment will be used in this subcommittee to inform future assignments in this course.	< SOWK Military 16-17 Report> < SOWK Military Cycle 1 Report>
Darla Moore School of Business Program: BSBA Accounting	Goal 1: LO4 Our graduates will understand the ethical dilemmas faced by accountants and how to respond to such dilemmas based on regulatory guidance.	Cases selected to assess understanding of the ethical dilemmas faced by accountants. (75% of students expected to score 70% or higher)	Using exam questions from two exams in ACCT 406 in Fall 2016, 59.26% of students scored 70% or higher on questions related to this Learning Outcome.	Student performance on questions related to LG4 suggests that the exam questions did not have sufficient discrimination. Given the inherent difficulty in objectively measuring meaningful outcomes related to LG4 (Understanding and Responding to Ethical Dilemmas), these results most likely suggest a need for a better measurement of LG4. Also, the instructor plans to continue efforts to make class content related to LG4 more personal and introspective.	93.69% of students had an overall average score of 70% or higher. However, only 63.96% of students scored 70% or higher on all questions.	The ethical dilemma appears to be a satisfactory measure for this learning goal, so this measure will be used in the future.	Although the results appear satisfactory based on an average score, additional focus may need to be given to helping students communicate their reasoning.	< UG Acctg 16-17 Report> < UG Acctg Cycle 1 Report

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Darla Moore School of Business</p> <p>Program: BA/BS Economics</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO3 Our graduates will be able to solve basic equations to find equilibrium outcomes and use graphs to understand and interpret economic relationships.</p>	<p>Seventy percent of students are expected to achieve an acceptable pass rate (75%) for all of the questions related to (a) Solving basic equations to find equilibrium outcomes; and (b) Using graphs to understand and interpret economic relationships.</p>	<p>Average scores on the measures selected for assessment:</p> <p>Final, 2016 – 60.8% Final, 2017 – 61% Multiple choice questions from quiz, 2016 – 76% Conceptual quiz, 2017 – 65%</p> <p>Based on these results, the program feels that students have met performance expectations.</p>	<p>While students’ performance fell below the established criteria for success, this was not entirely unexpected. For one, this is a particularly rigorous course. Secondly, there have been issues with students registering for the course or transferring into the program without the requisite foundation in quantitative knowledge. To address these issues going forward, students will be required to pass MATH 122 before transferring into any of the economics majors. Also, we are working with the University to ensure that prerequisite requirements are enforced when students attempt to register for this course in order to prevent students from taking this course before they have the proper foundation in quantitative knowledge.</p>	<p>Students were assessed for their ability to solve basic equations to find equilibrium outcomes using exam questions from ECON 321 from Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, and from ECON 322 from Fall 2018. In ECON 321 in Fall 2017, 77.3% of students received an average score of 75% or higher, with 77.1% meeting this criterion in Spring 2018. In ECON 322, the overall score for 2 questions used for assessment was 72.18%.</p> <p>The question with the worst performance was the first question administered to the ECON 322 students.</p>		<p>This is a complicated model to solve, so instructors in this class may want to spend more time ensuring that students are able to work with this kind of algebraic model.</p>	<p>< Economics BA/BS 16-17 Report ></p> <p>< Economics BA/BS Cycle 1 Report ></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>Darla Moore School of Business</p> <p>Program: PhD in Economics</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 Students will be able to approach economics-related issues theoretically. Students should demonstrate a mastery of the relevant literature and have an appreciation for the usefulness and limitations of a given theory.</p>	<p>The doctoral student will be evaluated on Oral and Written Qualifying exams, Written & Oral Comprehensive Exams, Dissertation Proposal and Dissertation Defense</p> <p>The performance criteria for Learning Goals (1) through (5) through the utilization of five scoring rubrics. The rating scale for all rubrics is as follows:</p> <p>Excellent -5 Good- 4 Adequate – 3 Fair – 2 Poor – 1</p> <p>It is expected that 85% of students will score adequate or better for this learning outcome.</p>	<p>For this learning outcome, three students were assessed. Their average scores for Command of Literature were 4, 4, and 2.5, resulting in 67% of students receiving an average score of Adequate or better. For Conceptual and Theoretical Rigor, their average scores were 3.75, 4, and 2.25, resulting in 67% of students receiving an average score of Adequate or better.</p>	<p>We are moving research requirements forward and replacing our theory field exam with a field paper to facilitate an early start to research. We will be assigning a committee to our students earlier after the second year and trying to put them on a fast track to publication before graduation. This constant communication with the faculty and early exposure to the research process should improve our students’ performance at the thesis stage and communication and teaching skills early on. Moreover, with the new hires we can offer a better variety of field courses to our students and give them more choice.</p>	<p>For the Comprehensive Exams and Dissertation Proposals, 100% of students scored ≥ 3 for both criteria. For the Dissertation Defenses, 86% of students scored ≥ 3 for both criteria.</p>	<p>We will continue to hold the research workshops and may change the meeting intensity. We will also assign this course to faculty who best matches each cohorts research interests but also have guest lecturers to address specific student research agendas. We will also increase the variety of field courses offered.</p> <p>Students should be given regular feedback on of their presentation and interpretation of the literature. In addition, we can ask instructors of field courses to focus on these skills as a part of their learning objectives and assess reports, papers, and presentations over the course of the semester with the same criteria and provide feedback to the students.</p>	<p>We have improved scores since our last assessment with recent cohorts performing significantly better. We added a research workshop for the third year of the program 4 years ago which meets biweekly. These biweekly meetings are aimed at improving quality of student research by focusing on methods to synthesize the existing literature and formulate questions and hypothesis and discussion of methods to tests these ideas. We have also replaced our second-year field exams with a third year paper which enables students to focus on more specific literature. We have changed the annual review forms to provide more guidelines to students on department expectations in terms of research at every stage of the program by customizing it to our departments schedule by year. These forms now give them better guidelines in timing of field/topic/advisor selection, thus making it possible to form more successful matches which should improve our students’ proficiency in their related fields.</p>	<p>< PhD Econ 16-17 Report></p> <p>< PhD Econ Cycle 1 Report></p>
--	--	---	---	---	--	--	--	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Darla Moore School of Business</p> <p>Program: PhD in Economics</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO2 Students will be able to analyze data. Students should have the ability to construct, estimate, and interpret economic models.</p>	<p>The doctoral student will be evaluated on Oral and Written Qualifying exams, Written & Oral Comprehensive Exams, Dissertation Proposal and Dissertation Defense</p> <p>The performance criteria for Learning Goals (1) through (5) through the utilization of five scoring rubrics. The rating scale for all rubrics is as follows:</p> <p>Excellent -5 Good- 4 Adequate – 3 Fair – 2 Poor – 1</p> <p>It is expected that 85% of students will score adequate or better for this learning outcome.</p>	<p>For this learning outcome, three students were assessed. Their average scores for Analytical Rigor were 4, 4.25, and 2, resulting in 67% of students receiving an average score of Adequate or better.</p> <p>Some students seem to have pursued inappropriate methodologies resulting in low scores for themselves and lowering the overall program average.</p>	<p>We will incorporate a research workshop and with an applied emphasis on the second-year courses to help with these issues. Our second- year courses are now more specialized and more in line with the teaching faculty’s research agenda, which gives them an edge in introducing the students to the latest in the field.</p> <p>Replacements of the field exams from theory form to a field paper should also help us identify students who are pursuing wrong approaches theoretically as well as econometrically.</p>	<p>For the Comprehensive Exams and Dissertation Proposals, 100% of students scored ≥ 3 for both criteria. For the Dissertation Defenses, 86% of students scored ≥ 3 for both criteria.</p>	<p>We can increase our efforts on this front. We can also encourage junior faculty to collaborate with the graduate students in earlier years. This will not only increase productivity but will be a hands-on learning experience for our students, making it easier to publish their own research.</p>	<p>We have also improved in this respect over the last few years. This was another benefit of the research workshop. We have been successful placing our students last year which we believe indicates our students are well trained in theory and research methods. Also, our students received research awards from the university and opportunities to intern at Federal Reserve Banks in Boston and Minneapolis.</p> <p>We have increased emphasis on the applied methods in the second-year courses. We will incorporate even more quantitative methods and data analysis to our curriculum.</p> <p>We encourage students to present their papers at many national conferences and our departmental brown bags. We also encourage research papers to be sent out for peer reviews in their 4th and 5th years, before graduation. In the last cohorts, we had students publish before graduation in highly respected field journals.</p>	<p>< PhD Econ 16-17 Report></p> <p>< PhD Econ Cycle 1 Report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>Darla Moore School of Business</p> <p>Program: BA Marketing</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO6 Students will develop an understanding of the strategic marketing management planning process.</p>	<p>Seventy-five percent of students are expected to score 70% or higher on all multiple-choice questions and problems on exams selected to assess understanding of the strategic marketing management planning process, and the ability to integrate and apply these concepts.</p>	<p>Students’ performance related to this learning outcome was assessed using 5 short answer questions from an exam given in MKTG 465 during Fall 2016. The overall average score students received was 80.86%, with 84.21% of students receiving an average score $\geq 70\%$, but only 2.63% of students received an average score $\geq 70\%$ on all measures selected to assess this outcome.</p>	<p>Although students’ performance related to this outcome fell well short of the criterion for success (2.63%/75%), the other averages (80.86% and 84.21%) show that students are performing well related to this learning outcome. As more questions etc. are added to the assessment (5 exam questions in this case), it becomes increasingly difficult to meet this goal. Going forward, the criterion for success for all learning outcomes with this criterion has been reworded to, “Seventy-five percent of students are expected to receive an average score of 70% or higher on the set of multiple- choice questions and problems on exams selected to assess...”</p>	<p>Students were assessed for their mastery of this Learning Outcome using essay questions in MKTG 465 in Fall 2018. The weighted average percent correct across 5 sections was 92.72%.</p>	<p>The assessment success criteria was changed to, “ It is expected that the average score will be 75% or higher on the set of questions and/or problems on exams selected to assess understanding of the strategic marketing management planning process, and the ability to integrate and apply these concepts.</p>	<p>This is the result of a poorly worded success criterion. As currently worded, the current criterion for success sets unrealistic expectations, as students are expected to score $\geq 70\%$ on all questions in order to be counted as having met expectations.</p>	<p>< BA Marketing 16-17 Report ></p> <p>< BA Marketing Cycle 1 Report ></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
<p>School of Medicine</p> <p>Program: MD</p>	<p>Goal 3: LO1 Students will demonstrate an awareness of, and responsiveness to, the larger context and system of health care, utilizing other resources in the system to provide care for patients. Students will acknowledge the relationship between the patient, the community, and the health care system and the impact on health culture, economics, the environment, health literacy, health policy, and advocacy.</p>	<p>1. AAMC Graduation Questionnaire: Data from the AAMC Graduation Questionnaire should show 85% of our students indicate an understanding of this area.</p> <p>2. PGY-I Survey: Post graduate surveys of their supervisors should show that 60% of their supervisors rated our graduates' performance in this area (therapeutic and patient management skills) to be at least above average 4.0/5.0.</p> <p>3. IHI Basic Certificate in Quality and Safety: At least 95% of the graduating class will have obtained this certification.</p>	<p>AAMC Graduation Questionnaire: 93.4% (N=78) of the Class of 2016 agreed or strongly agreed to the statement "I have the basic skills in clinical decision making and application of evidence-based information to medical practice," as compared to 94% nationwide.</p> <p>Surveys sent to residency training directors (N=54) for the Class of 2016 one year after graduation, rated our graduates as 3.64/5.0 on their therapeutic and patient management skills.</p> <p>IHI Basic Certificate in Quality and Safety: 100% of the graduating class obtained this certification.</p>	<p>Results fell slightly below the national average on the AAMC Graduation Questionnaire concerning preparation to practice medicine. The SOM will conduct a survey of all current students (N=390) to further explore the reasons for declining satisfaction with preparation to practice medicine in 2018.</p>	<p>Data from the AAMC Graduation Questionnaire show that 91% (n=67) of our students agree/or strongly agree that they have an understanding of this area. The national average is 94%.</p> <p>PGY-I Survey of resident supervisors (n=36) show that 94% rated our graduates as 4.1/5.0 on therapeutic and management skills.</p> <p>100% (n=97) of the graduating class obtained this certificate.</p>	<p>Results in this area on the AAMC Graduation Questionnaire remain below the national average which may be attributed, at least in part, to the low response rate to the questionnaire. We will attempt to increase participation by leaving the questionnaire open several weeks longer in the future.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Again, the response rate of supervisors of our graduates in residency programs is very low. Given the workload of residency program directors, we will try to increase the response rate by leaving the questionnaire open for an additional period of time.</p> <p>Attainment of the IHI Basic Certificate in Quality and Safety has now become a requirement for graduation and will be removed as a criteria in the future</p>	<p><Insert SOM MD 16-17 Assessment report></p> <p>< SOM MD cycle 1 Assessment report></p>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
 AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
School of Medicine Program: Master of Rehabilitation Counseling now Master of Arts in Rehabilitation Counseling	Goal 1: LO7 Students will demonstrate effective individual counseling and communication skills appropriate for beginning counselors at the training level.	At least 85% of students in RHAB 711 will learn and demonstrate specific counseling techniques associated with counseling theories by videotaping 4 counseling sessions and earning 9 of 12 points on each session on a grading rubric that includes three elements: basic listening and attending skills, use of counseling techniques, and students’ ability to articulate theory-based rationale supporting the choice of techniques.	14/15 or 93.3% earned at least 9 of 12 points on the target assignments. One student could not complete for medical reasons, or the percentage would have been higher. The instructor reports that he felt a new rubric would improve outcomes.	Student performance on the RHAB 711 course was also acceptable, but the instructor felt that a new rubric for the assignment may be helpful. The new rubric was developed and successfully deployed in Spring 2017.	21/21 students (100%) met the goal.	One student did struggle to meet the criteria in the allotted timeframe of the semester, but later was able to display excellent skills. The faculty member’s developmental approach with this student seemed to be effective in helping the individual to reach the standard.	Course content was folded into the new 60 credit hour MA program in course RCON 711. Future data on these measures will be collected as part of the MA program assessment process.	< MRC 16-17 Report> < MRC Cycle 1 Report>

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

<p>Palmetto College Program: Associate of Science in Business</p>	<p>Goal 1: LO1 As a result of instruction and student participation, students should be able to perform basic functions of business financial operations to make informed decisions about the operating performance and financial position of a company.</p>	<p>Given assignment(s) on business financial operations, 70% of students should achieve a minimum score of 2-At Standard as measured on the Accounting and Financial Skills scoring rubric.</p>	<p>The results for this assessment cycle show a decrease in the percentage of students who scored at or above standard from 95% in the 2015-2016 assessment cycle to 74% for the current assessment cycle. This drop is attributed to the removal of the second attempt function that provided students an additional attempt at calculating missed questions. The decision to remove the second attempt function was made by faculty during the 2015-2016 review of results.</p>	<p>A preliminary review of the results by faculty was directed by the chair of the assessment committee, at this time it was determined that changes to the assessment process utilized with this learning outcome are not warranted. A more in-depth review will be conducted at the start of the Fall 2017 semester. It was recommended that during the Fall review faculty may want to consider an item analysis be undertaken to determine specific problematic areas, if any, especially with the close similarities in scores in the two sections of the course.</p>	<p>70% proficiency was met for all four assessed sections of ACCT 225, Introduction to Financial Accounting, for the Fall 2018 and Fall 2019 assessment periods.</p>	<p>After reviewing the results, the faculty responsible for teaching ACCT 225, Introduction to Financial Accounting, in conjunction with other members of the Business Division made the following recommendations:</p> <p>Continue assessment of ACCT 225, Introduction to Financial Accounting. Maintain current designated level of proficiency. Maintain current methods of assessment and scoring. Consider possible changes in level of mastery after two - three additional assessment cycles.</p>	<p>The disruption to teaching and learning due to COVID 19 carried into any meaningful dialog regarding assessment results for Fall 2019. A meeting of faculty to discuss assessment results will depend on the opening of campus for faculty meetings and other variables.</p> <p>It is important for faculty members to discuss administration of assessments and other related topics during periods of emergency distance learning. Areas that faculty may consider critical to the assessment process during such a time as with COVID- 19 include, but certainly not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administering e-assessments via Blackboard. • Time or untimed e-assessments. • Ensuring academic honesty with e-assessments. • Student access to a home computer and Internet service. • Different types of assessments. 	<p>< PC AS Business 16-17 Report></p> <p>< PC AS Business Cycle 1 Report></p>
---	--	---	---	--	--	---	---	---

Examples of “Closing the Loop” -Includes Program Assessment Reports by College
AY2016-2017 and Cycle 1 (Fall 2017 – Spring 2020)

	Learning Outcome	Assessment Measure(s)	AY- 16-17 Results	Program Changes In Response to AY-16-17 Results	Cycle 1 Results	Cycle 1 Actions	Did it work? Next Steps	Links to Complete Reports
School of Music Program: BA/BM Music	Goal 1: LO1 All BA & BM candidates will perform a series of jury exams on their primary instrument or voice. Each exam will engage the candidate in performance of a wide array of musical styles reflective of undergraduate-level literature.	Jury Exams rated by the area faculty in one of four categories (from highest to lowest), "Excellent", "Acceptable", "Marginal", or "Fails to Meet Criteria". Approximately 90% of students will receive a rating of “Acceptable” or higher.	Ninety-nine percent of candidates (425/429) passed with ratings of 'Excellent' or 'Acceptable.	In 2016-17, the School of Music Assessment Committee implemented new rubrics for BM Juries, which more clearly differentiate levels of achievement. These rubrics have provided better feedback for candidates and have proved to be a positive addition to the jury process.	In 17-18, 98% percent of candidates (463/473) passed with ratings of 'Excellent' or 'Acceptable. In 18 -19, 98% percent of candidates (502/512) passed with ratings of 'Excellent' or 'Acceptable.	During assessment cycle one, an online jury reporting process was implemented by the voice and brass applied faculty.	Feedback from students and faculty regarding the new method was very favorable. The School of Music assessment committee recommends adoption of the online process by other applied areas in 2020-21. In addition, applied faculty will evaluate jury exam rubrics for effectiveness and suggest changes where needed.	< MUSIC BA/BM 16-17 Assessment report> < MUSIC BA/BM Cycle 1 Assessment report>