

Academic Assessment Report Feedback for Academic Programs 2016-2017

Overall the Assessment Committee noted an area of strength for department reporting is the increased use of direct assessment and the use of scoring rubrics. The two areas most cited for improvement related to department assessment reporting are, 1) student learning outcomes, and 2) reporting data in a comprehensive and clear manner.

History and Political Science

Report Strengths:

- Bachelor of Arts in History SLO's are good.
- SLO's are clear, concise, and measurable.
- Good rubric.
- The report made understanding the department's assessment process very understandable.

Suggestions for improvement:

- Missing most data for next year, some SLO's are program-based instead of student-based.
- Analysis and interpretation could be more detailed; what were grades? Indirect evidence is missing.
- Question whether the SLO's are that. Little in term of indirect assessment.

Assessment Committee Comments:

- What changes will be made? Any?
- Move forward with this year's assessment.

English

Report Strengths:

- Concise and complete.
- Assessment method, use of rubric.
- Strong and focused SLO's.
- The report made understanding the department's assessment process very understandable.

Suggestions for improvement:

- Could word SLO's as how they are assessable is better understood, more clear; doesn't specify which aspects of the SLO student did well on and what needs improved.

- More analysis and what the department makes of these data.

Assessment Committee comments:

- Move forward with this year's assessment.
- Overall well done.
- Raising the goal doesn't directly improve student learning. Raise standards of the curriculum.

Communications

Report Strengths:

- Clear example of how assessment is being used to assist the program.
- Good assessment methods.
- The report made understanding the department's assessment process very understandable. Excellent plan to make sure that students who participate in the oral history project are able to do at least basic work.
- Assessment methods, use of results.

Suggestions for improvement:

- Some SLO's are missing verbs – apply, demonstrate, list, analyze, etc.
- Make sure SLO's are concise.
- What is being done to assist students who fail to qualify for the oral history capstone?

Assessment Committee comments:

- Please upload the rubric so we can see what basic, proficient, etc. means. Please revise SLO assessment chart schedule to match 17/18 assessment plan in report.
- Nicely done.
- Move forward with this year's assessment.

Business

Report strengths:

- Methods – rubric and course evaluations; SLO's.
- One of few reports to use assessment results in at least two ways.
- Logical, adequate detail.
- The report made understanding the department's assessment process very understandable. The uploaded documentation was extremely thorough and showed the tremendous amount of care the department puts forward to ensure that student's achieve excellence.

Suggestions for improvement:

- What needs improved related to student learning? Rubric doesn't tell us specifics, just an overall score. IDEA #8 and #13 show most disagreement – doing what to improve?
- Have not identified an SLO for 2018-2019.
- Use of data is not really discussed. Discussion is focused on a new faculty.

Assessment Committee comments:

- Good deal.
- Move forward with this year's assessment.

Philosophy and Religion

Report Strengths:

- Thorough report, great documentation.

Suggestions for improvement:

- Not much evidence of indirect assessment.
- Remove "and"s from department SLO's, SLO's assessed need to come from department SLO's – should match.
- Consider indirect assessment methods, are majors being assessed in class or just by the instructor without communication with the major?

Assessment Committee Comment:

- Well done.