



# Academic Program Assessment Report: 2016-2017

## Executive Summary

This report presents the work accomplished in Viterbo University's academic programs in understanding, confirming, and improving student learning. It summarizes the assessment results of the academic year 2016-17 reported in fall 2017.

### **Strengthening Learning through Assessment in Undergraduate and Graduate Programs**

Of the 55 established academic programs (both undergraduate and graduate):

- All have data on student learning and are in the process of analyzing the data
- All have taken action taken to improve student learning.
- 98% (54/55) have tested the effectiveness of actions, either confirming learning or taking further action.

The academic programs regularly utilize assessment for targeted changes and confirming learning. The emphasis is on direct measures; indirect assessment at the program level is supplemental.

\*\*In 2016-2017, 55 of the academic programs are considered established programs. There are several programs which were discontinued, and several new programs which are on the five-year assessment implementation cycle. Some programs with low enrollments do not update results annually.

### **Strengthening Learning through Assessment in the Core Curriculum**

Following the assessment rotation cycle, the focus in 2016-17 was on assessing learning outcomes through the Foundations and Ways of Thinking.

- **Foundations—Oral Communication:** Faculty decided on targeted changes following two terms of assessment. Follow-up will occur in 2017-18
- **Integrating Faith and Practice:** Three terms of assessment, with adjustments and follow-up, have resulted in increased scores. Follow-up will continue in 2017-18 until the criterion is met.
- **Theological Inquiry:** The criteria have been met after actions were implemented.
- **Literary Analysis:** Although the criteria were met, faculty decided to follow-up with another round of assessment by applying the revised learning outcomes and rubric.
- **Artistic Engagement:** Faculty met to develop a common assessment rubric and prepare for assessment in 2017-18.

### **Assessment Practice and Progress**

Faculty oversight of academic program assessment is provided through the Academic Program Assessment Committee, and in 2016-17, the committee:

- Provided in-depth formative peer review on assessment work for eight academic programs a year before their program review.
- Recommended the TracDat upgrade.
- Provided input to OAIR in creating user guides for the TracDat upgrade and for the five TracDat sessions held by OAIR.
- Confirmed the request to the VPAA that assessment time for departments would be included in spring out-service week. Those dates were May 18 and 19, 2017.
- Set the goal for 2017-18 to work with OAIR on a workshop focused on effective use of TracDat to log follow-up assessment after taking actions. Efficiencies can be gained if the query can capture all actions and follow-up.
- Established and communicated the goal of updated mission and goals in TracDat by Sept. 2017.

Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director  
Office of Assessment and Institutional Research

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Use of Assessment in the LIVE Core Curriculum	
Foundations .....	3
Oral Communication: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment .....	3
Ways of Thinking .....	6
Literary Analysis: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment.....	6
Integrating Faith and Practice: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment .....	9
Theological Inquiry: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment .....	11
Use of Assessment in Academic Programs	
College of Arts and Letters.....	14
School of Fine Arts .....	14
School of Humanities .....	18
College of Business and Leadership .....	23
Dahl School of Business .....	23
Degree Completion Programs.....	28
Servant Leadership Department.....	31
College of Education, Science, and Mathematics .....	33
School of Education .....	33
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics .....	42
College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior .....	45
School of Nursing .....	45
School of Health and Human Behavior .....	48

## Use of Assessment in the Core Curriculum Foundations

### Oral Communication: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

**Method:** Final oral presentation in all courses approved for Oral Communication Foundation

**Measurement:** Oral Communication rubric

Spring 2017 Oral Communication Courses		
Course	Instructor	Students
ARTS 351	L Lenarz	13
COMM 150	C. Thaldorf	11
CRMJ 265 / SOCL 265	R. Anderson	11
EDUC 255	M. Langeberg	13
ENGL 255	R. Samuels	5
MGMT 230	C. Thaldorf	9
NURS 240 01	J. Meyers	34
NURS 240 02	J. Meyers	29
NURS 240 03	K. Warner	33
NURS 240 04	K. Warner	33
SOWK 275	C. Fossen	9
SPAN 306	M. Bird	14
THTR 291	J. McLean	9
PSYC 270	S. Thorson-Olesen	20

Working group: Derek Cortez, Stephanie Thorson-Olesen, Janet McLean

All instructors teaching OC courses spring 2017 provided to AIR the following materials:

- A completed syllabus/assignment questionnaire.
- Section specific assignment description that will be used for assessment purposes.
- Section specific assessment assignment rubric.
- Course syllabus.
- OC presentation scores

On Thursday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, the group met from 10:30-12:00 to:

- 1) Apply the OC rubric to a recorded presentation and discuss results;
- 2) Reach a conclusion about spring 2017 OC assessment results;
- 3) Decide on targeted changes;
- 4) Decide on next steps in OC assessment or curriculum.

Participants: Maribel Bird, Melinda Langeberg, Lisa Lenarz, Julie Meyers, Janet McLean, Rolf Samuels, Carey Thaldorf.

Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier, Instructional Designer; Frank Ludwig, Director of the Core Curriculum; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research

### Oral Communication Assessment Results: Spring 2017

All 14 sections of OC courses supplied scores. The results are based on scores for the 241 students from these sections.

	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message	Total
Mean	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.8	17.9
Lowest	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.1	2.8	13.3
Highest	4	3.9	3.8	4	4	19.1
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	18.4
Mode	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	19.0
Standard Deviation	.5	.5	.7	.6	.4	2.2

### Oral Communication Assessment Results: 2011

2011 Results	Organization	Language	Delivery	Supporting Material	Central Message
Mean	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.1	3.3

#### Analysis of results:

Oral Communication Presentation Scores: The criterion (the average score overall and for each component of the rubric will meet or exceed the novice level of 2) is exceeded for all five components and overall. Both the median and the mode for all five components is 4 on a 4-point scale, indicating that the highest score possible is applied with great frequency.

The framing language of the OC rubric indicates that the instrument “is specifically designed to evaluate oral presentations of a single speaker at a time” and that for group presentations “it is recommended that each speaker be evaluated separately.”

The results, along with norming discussions about the meaning of defining terms in the OC rubric and varying applications and expectations, indicate a need for formal norming before follow-up results.

Oral Communication Self-Evaluation Inventory: Spring 2017 courses vary in the percentage of course activity dedicated to developing purposeful presentation skills from 10% to 80%. They also vary in the percentage of the final grade related to oral presentation projects from 12% to 50%.

#### Targeted actions:

##### 1) Faculty development or learning community

One of the premises for oral communication as a foundation is that the novice level can be achieved in a variety of courses—from COMM 150, which is entirely focused on oral communication, to required courses in the majors, which focus on oral communication in addition to other outcomes. Another premise is that oral communication presentation skills are taught in a manner that can be transferred to another discipline.

- Create a SharePoint site for all instructors of OC—with syllabi, assignments, rubrics, and other helpful course material
- Support new faculty teaching an OC course through onboarding and mentoring. The onboarding by department chairs includes sharing information about how a particular course fits in to the

curriculum of both the major and of the core curriculum. Mentoring may be accomplished either by chairs or a designated mentor in the OC working group or learning community.

- Share best practices for teaching OC (effective OC texts and/or materials, effective scaffolding of instruction, effective assignment design and feedback methods) through a faculty development workshop.

### 2) Refine OC guidelines and CCC criteria for oral communication courses:

- Should there be a requirement for course materials on prepared, purposeful oral presentations?
- Should there be a threshold for percentage of OC instruction as percentage of overall course instruction?
- Should there be a threshold for the OC assignments as percentage of final grade?
- The syllabi should explicitly include the OC outcomes and identify the course as an OC course.

### 3) Assessment process and tools

- Meet with working group to review results, finalize plan, and refine rubric (at least define or give example of qualifying terms).
- Fall in-service OC workshop: 1) review rubric refinements, 2) apply rubric to at least two recorded presentations for norming, 3) share schedule and expectations for section OC assessment.
- Explore the utility of providing support and logistics for recording a day of presentations for every section in F17?

### Plan for 2017-2018:

Date	Task	People involved
Jun-Jul	Review results, finalize plan, refine rubric	OC working group: Derek, Stephanie, Janet; Frank; Cari; Naomi
Jun	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Jun	Launch SharePoint site	AIR
Jul-Aug	Collect 2-3 recordings for norming	AIR / ID
Aug	Communicate with F17 instructors: in-service session, expectations and schedule. Communicate with chairs	AIR / CC / ID
In-service	OC workshop	AIR / CC / ID
Sep	OC best practices panel	OC working group / faculty development?
Oct	Schedule recording sessions	
Nov/Dec	Record sessions	
Dec	Collect OC scores & course materials	AIR
In-service	OC assessment session	OC working group; CC; AIR; ID

### Feedback loop:

The working group and spring instructors receive a summary, with their own section results inserted. Working group finalizes action plan and communicates it with chairs, fall 2017 OC instructors, and ongoing OC instructors. Results uploaded into TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.

## Ways of Thinking

### Literary Analysis: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

**Method:** Instructor-designated final literary analysis papers from all courses approved for Literary Analysis

**Measurement:** Current Literary Analysis rubric

**Assessment process:**

Course Name	Faculty	Subj	Course #	Section	# Enrolled
Child and Adolescent Lit	L. Stroik	EDUC	280	1	25
The Short Story	N. Zavodski	ENGL	208	CAL (online)	26
Survey American Lit II	R. Samuels	ENGL	221	1	13
Survey British Lit III	E. Marzoni	ENGL	233	1	12
Lit and Healing Arts	K. Samuels	ENGL	243	1	21
Chaucer and His Age	V. Holtz	ENGL	328	1	10
Shakespeare	S. Ronnenberg	ENGL	336	1	14
Women Writers After 1700	A. Denny	ENGL	347-1	CAL (online)	19
Western Masterpieces	J. Wellik	ENGL	354-3	CAL (online)	16
Survey of Spanish Lit	J. Jambrina	SPAN	314	1	9
Drama American Repertory	J. McLean	THTR	320	1	14
Women in Theatre	J. McLean	VUSM	252	1	21

Working Group: Tammy Clark, Rolf Samuels, Sherri Lisota

All instructors teaching the 12 LA courses in spring 2017 were asked to provide to AIR the following materials:

- Assignment description
- LA scores
- A sample student essay from every section

On Wednesday, May 17<sup>th</sup>, the group met from 1:00-2:30 to:

- 1) reach a conclusion about LA assessment results;
- 2) review proposed changes in the LA outcomes;
- 3) begin the work of revising the LA rubric;
- 4) decide on next steps

Participants: Tammy Clark, Susan Cosby Ronnenberg, Vickie Holtz-Wodzak, Jesus Jambrina, Sherri Lisota, Beth Marzoni, Janet McLean, Rolf Samuels

Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier, Instructional Designer; Frank Ludwig, Director of the Core Curriculum; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research

#### Literary Analysis Assessment Results: Spring 2017

Three of the 12 sections were taught the first block of the term by two adjuncts and a professor on sabbatical. These materials were not collected. Results from seven of the nine literary analysis courses for the full or second block of the spring 2017 term were collected. 100 students out of 108 completed the courses and submitted the literary analysis assignment.

The overall average is 2.6. With the exception of 1-B (which is optional), the averages were at or above 2.5 for every component of the rubric. The averages of 200-level courses were lower than those of 300-level courses, which is expected.

Norming session: For the first norming essay, reviewers' scores differed by more than one point for "Identifies how language manifests meaning" and for "cites textual evidence." The group discussed differences and was in agreement on the second norming essay.

#### Analysis of results:

Overall, faculty were satisfied with the results, which align with the current outcomes and rubric. The group concurred with a criterion of a 2.5 average for the literary analysis outcome components. This criterion is met.

	1-A.	1-B.	2.	3.	4.	5.	Total
Mean	2.5	2.3	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.0	15.6
Mode	2	2	3	3	3	3	18
Median	2	2	3	3	3	3	15
2XXX Av.	2.4	2.1	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.7	14.2
3XXX Av.	2.7	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.3	18.1

Discussion focused on the proposal from the working group to move from five outcomes to two outcomes, removing the strand of citing evidence from the literary analysis outcomes. One area of discussion was the concern that the reduction of outcomes is making the aims of literary analysis too simplistic or too generic. Following discussion, Rolf revised the second proposed outcome to read, "Derive apt evidence from a literary text to support an interpretive claim." Most faculty support the move from five outcomes to two outcomes.

#### Targeted actions:

1. The working group will develop the rubric for the proposed outcomes and will present the rubric to the full group of instructors by fall in-service.
2. Launch the SharePoint site for all literary analysis instructors.
3. Support new faculty teaching an LA course through onboarding and mentoring.
4. Fall in-service LA workshop: 1) review rubric, 2) apply rubric to norming essays, 3) share timeline and expectations for collecting section assessment.

#### Plan for 2017-2018:

Date	Task	People involved
Jun	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Jun-Jul	Launch SharePoint	AIR / CC / ID
Jun-Jul	Develop rubric, connect to CC outcomes, finalize plan	Working group / AIR / CC / ID
Aug	Communicate with F17 instructors: in-service session, expectations and schedule	AIR / CC
Aug	LA workshop	Working group / AIR / CC / ID
Sep	Send e-mail with instructions and template	AIR

Oct	Collect LA scores & course materials from first block courses.	AIR
Dec	Collect LA scores & course materials	AIR
Jan	LA assessment session	AIR / CC / ID

**Feedback loop:** The working group and spring instructors receive a summary of results and action plan. Working group develops rubric and with AIR / CC / ID finalizes action plan. AIR uploads results into TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.

## Integrating Faith and Practice: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

**Method:** Instructor-designated assignment in all courses approved for Integrating Faith and Practice.

**Measurement:** Integrating Faith and Practice (IFP) rubric

**Assessment process:**

Spring 2017 IFP Courses			
Section	Mode	Faculty	Enrollment
RLST-222-001	F2F	W. Reese	14
RLST-262-001	CAL Online	E. Dykman	20
RLST-343-001	F2F	L. Nettles	27
RLST-425-001	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	6
RLST-433-001	F2F	L. Harwood	21
RLST-433-002	F2F	W. Reese	21
RLST-433-004	CAL Online	W. Reese	18
RLST-433-005	CAL Online	S. Minnema	13
VUSM-226-001	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	19
VUSM-325-001	F2F	R. Kuhl	23
VUSM-325-002	CAL Online	J. Eyster	21
VUSM-431-001	F2F	W. Reese	24

TI/IFP Working group: Michael Lopez-Kaley, Emily Dykman, Mary Therese Rinzel, Ward Jones, Michael Wodzak, Lynne Kuhl

Instructors teaching IFP courses spring 2017 provided to AIR the following materials:

- Assignment description
- Assignment rubric
- IFP scores
- Sample (mid-range, typical) student essay

On Thursday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, the group met from 3:00 – 4:00 to:

1. Reach a conclusion about IFP scores
2. Conduct a norming session on two essays
3. Decide on next steps: revising outcomes, guidelines, and/or rubric

Participants: Emily Dykman, Lynne Kuhl, Michael Lopez-Kaley, Laura Nettles, Chris Rogers

Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier; Frank Ludwig; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl

### Integrating Faith and Practice Assessment Results: Spring 2017

In spring 2017, 12 IFP courses were offered, with an enrollment of 226 students. Instructors submitted scores for nine of the 12 sections: one instructor submitted no materials or scores, the scores for one section were not useable because they were given as a range, and the instructor for one section submitted scores in alignment with the second Theological Inquiry outcome. The results are based on scores for the 169 students from the nine sections. The following assessment results reflect 75% of the students enrolled in the IFP courses.

### Analysis of results:

The criterion is an average of 2.5. The average for the 2017 data is 2.4 for both outcomes. The criterion is not met. In 2016, the average was 1.8 for both outcomes, so the scores have increased significantly following targeted changes.

Norming session: The group in attendance was aligned on scores for the three norming essays. The conclusion is that there is a good common understanding among full-time faculty, and that a norming session at the beginning of fall term will be useful as a way of mentoring adjunct faculty and of sharing teaching and learning strategies around the common aims of IFP courses.

	<b>Outcome 1: Theological Constructs</b>	<b>Outcome 2: Theology in Practice</b>
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>
Mode	2.0	2.0
Median	2.5	2.5
Standard Deviation	0.8	0.7
F2F	2.3	2.4
CAL Online	2.4	2.4
RLST	2.4	2.4
VUSM	2.2	2.3

**Targeted actions:**

1. The fall term will begin with a workshop for all faculty teaching IFP courses, which will include a norming session, discussion about teaching and learning strategies, and the process for follow-up assessment.
2. The goal for fall term is to collect useable scores for all IFP sections.
3. Clarify expectations for IFP with instructors of VUSM co-counting sections.
4. Establish a learning community and launch SharePoint site for course materials.

**Plan for 2017-2018:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>People involved</b>
June	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Jun-Jul	Review results, finalize plan, refine rubric, identify connection to CT and IL outcomes	IFP working group and CC, ID, and AIR
Jul	Launch SharePoint site for learning community	CC, ID, AIR
Aug	Communicate with F17 instructors: in-service session, expectations, and schedule.	AIR
In-service	IFP workshop	IFP working group and CC, ID, and AIR
Oct	Send e-mail with instructions and score template	AIR
Dec	Collect IFP scores & course materials	AIR
Jan	IFP assessment session during in-service	IFP working group, instructors, and CC, ID, and AIR

**Feedback loop:** The working group and spring instructors receive a summary, with their own section results. The working group, with Frank, Cari, and Naomi finalize plan for 2017-2018 and prepare for workshop. Results are uploaded into TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.

## Theological Inquiry: LIVE Learning Outcomes Assessment

Spring 2017 Results, Targeted Actions, and Next Steps

**Methods:** Outcome 1—post-test multiple choice section; Outcome 2—post-test essay question 1

**Measurement:** Outcome 1—analysis of scores; Outcome 2—apply rubric to essay question 1

**Assessment process:**

Spring 2017 Theological Inquiry Courses			
Section	Location	Faculty	Enrollment
RLST-160-001	F2F	S. Minnema	27
RLST-160-002	F2F	R. Kuhl	23
RLST-160-003	F2F	L. Nettles	25
RLST-160-004	F2F	L. Nettles	24
RLST-160-005	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	23
RLST-160-006	F2F	M. Lopez-Kaley	24
RLST-160-007	CAL Online	C. Rogers	22
RLST-160-008	F2F	E. Dykman	21
RLST-342-001	F2F	S. Minnema	22
RLST-342-003	CAL Online	L. Jordan	17
RLST-342-004	CAL Online	L. Jordan	16
RLST-342-005	CAL Online	A. Hokenstad	17

Working group: Lynne Kuhl

Instructors teaching courses in spring 2017 provided to ID or AIR the following materials:

- Scantron or Moodle post-tests
- TI scores on post-test essay question 1

On Thursday, May 18<sup>th</sup>, the group met from 2:30-3:00 to:

1. Reach a conclusion about post-test scores
2. Reach a conclusions about essay scores
3. Decide on next steps

Participants: Emily Dykman, Michael Lopez-Kaley, Sr. Laura Nettles, Chris Rogers

Co-Facilitators: Cari Mathwig Ramseier, Instructional Designer; Frank Ludwig, Director of the Core Curriculum; Naomi Stennes-Spidahl, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research

### Theological Inquiry Assessment Results: Spring 2017

Ten of the 12 sections of TI courses supplied complete materials. The results are based on scores for the 211 students from these sections.

**Outcome 1 Results:** Criteria: TI aims for a novice level. This is achieved when at least 80% of students achieve an overall score of 70% or higher. An average of at least 70% on the apprentice and proficient subset of questions indicates an apprentice level.

**Spring 2017 results:** 84.6% (188/211) of students had an overall score of 70% or higher on the primary subset of questions. Students scored an average of 82.8% on the apprentice and proficient subset of questions. Criteria met.

**2015-2016 results** (incomplete): 84.4% (157/186) of students had an overall score of 70% or higher on the primary subset of questions. Students scored an average of 83.7% on the apprentice and proficient subset of questions. Criteria met.

**Outcome 2 Results:** Criteria: Students achieve an average of at least a 2 on Outcome 2.

**Spring 2017 results:** The overall average was 2.3. There were 8 sections of RLST 160 and 4 sections RLST 342 in spring 2017. One of the RLST 160 sections had used an older version of the post-test, so that section was not included. Scores were not submitted for the essay question for another RLST 160 section. The work of 190 students was included in the assessment process. Outcome 2 was measured by applying the rubric to Essay Question 1 on the post-test.

	<b>Outcome 2</b>
Overall Average	2.3
Standard Deviation	1.0
Median	2.5
Mode	2.0
RLST 160 Average	2.1
RLST 342 Average	2.5
CAL Online Average	2.4
F2F Average	2.2

**Analysis of results:**

The criteria are met, the assessment methods are deemed to be valid and reliable, and learning is confirmed. The consistency of post-test multiple choice results between last year and this year is remarkable. Overall the results reflect perception of student performance. Although the criteria were met, faculty registered some disappointment in the results, in particular the RLST 160 scores.

Full-time faculty had normed the application of the rubric to essay question one in spring 2017. Emily Dykman then mentored adjunct faculty applying the rubric to essay question one.

**Targeted actions:**

Although the criteria are met, the following targeted actions will be taken:

- 1) Full-time faculty will refine the multiple-choice questions for clarity, working from questions with low performance.
- 2) In Fall 2017, the Religious Studies department, along with the Theological Inquiry working group, will hold a norming session for all faculty (full-time and adjunct) to apply the rubric to sample responses to essay question one. This exercise will launch discussion on effective teaching practices and learning strategies for the outcomes of TI courses.

**Plan for 2017-2018:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>People involved</b>
June	Finalize results documentation and share with TI group	TI faculty / CC: Frank / ID: Cari / AIR: Naomi
June	Enter results into TracDat	AIR
Aug	Refine post-test questions	RLST faculty

Aug	TI session on norming, teaching & learning strategies	RLST faculty and working group faculty
-----	---	--

**Feedback loop:**

The summary of results is shared with the working group and spring instructors. AIR uploads results into the Core Curriculum unit of TracDat for the September 2017 deadline.



















## College of Business and Leadership

### Assessment Report for College of Business and Leadership: Sept. 2017 Updates

Dahl School of Business			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up*
Accounting	09/15/2017	09/15/2017	09/28/2013
Business Administration	09/20/2017	09/20/2017	09/30/2016
Creative Media Design	09/29/2017	09/29/2017	
Finance	New Program		
Health Care and Wellness Management	New Program		
Management and Leadership	09/28/2017	09/30/2016	09/25/2014
Marketing	09/15/2017	05/15/2017	09/15/2017
Master of Business Administration	09/26/2017	09/26/2017	09/26/2017
Sport Management & Leadership	09/27/2017	08/28/2015	05/19/2016
Degree Completion Programs			
Accounting Degree Completion	09/15/2017	09/15/2017	05/18/2011
Health Care Management	09/12/2017	09/12/2017	
Management Information Systems (INFO) Online	09/30/2017	09/28/2017	08/31/2011
Organizational Management (Classroom-based)	09/25/2017	09/25/2017	09/20/2012
Organizational Management (Online)	09/25/2017	09/25/2017	09/02/2011
Professional Studies	09/30/2017	09/30/2017	
Servant Leadership Department			
Master of Arts in Servant Leadership	10/13/2017	10/13/2017	10/13/2017
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2017. The query pulls only the information input into the follow-up section.			

### 2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Business and Leadership Dahl School of Business

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Sabrina Steger**

**Name of Program: Accounting**

#### 1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

For most measures, we met the criterion requirements during the 2016-2017 academic year.

For the Ethical Decision-Making learning outcome, where we didn't meet the criterion requirements, we will change the measure to a single case study, and only take this measure in ACCT 312 (rather than in both 311 and 312). We will use an ethical case study that comes later in the course, after they have had some practice in addressing other ethical cases. This should help them to learn and apply a method for addressing these ethical cases.

In all learning outcomes, with new accounting faculty who may have designed slightly different assessment techniques, we will work on updating the assessment plan to verify the measures remain



Animation I/II). We'll continue to talk to students about the minor and will focus on ways to make it attractive to business majors.

However, no additional students in the CRMD major have been accepted for Fall 2017 or thereafter. CRMD faculty will work on a teach-out plan to be completed over the next 2 years for courses in the major.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: John Robinson**

**Name of Program: Finance**

**1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

Not Applicable, the Finance major was new in 2016-17. No assessment data has been collected for the 16-17 academic year.

**2. Plan for 2017-2018**

In 2017-2018, we will focus on the implementation of an assessment program for this major. As new courses are developed, assessment measures will be identified. Data will be collected for the first time in 2017-2018 for some of the learning outcomes (for those courses that are running in the 17-18 academic year), and analyzed at the end of the year.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Brian Rotty**

**Name of Program: Health Care and Wellness Management**

**1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

Not applicable. The Health Care and Wellness major was new in 2016-17. No assessment data has been collected for the 16-17 academic year.

**2. Plan for 2017-2018**

We will focus on the implementation of an assessment program for this major, especially in regards to the outcomes as they relate to Wellness Programs, since this is not an element of the HMG T major. As new courses are developed, assessment measures will be identified. Data will be collected for the first time in 2017-2018 for some of the learning outcomes, and analyzed at the end of the year.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke**

**Name of Program: Management & Leadership**

**1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

In 2016-17, most of the student learning outcomes have been met for the Management and Leadership program. One of the measures was below our criterion requirements – in the collaboration with diverse groups outcome. In MGMT 474, the teamwork component scores were low. We will look at some







We also noted several places where grade distinction is needed, and likely needs development of rubrics to allow for this distinction, in addition to some adjunct faculty development, to help them understand the importance of distinguishing work quality from one student to the next.

Many of the measures for the 2016-2017 data met the criterion requirements. However, there are a couple outcomes where we didn't meet the criterion, specifically in HMGT 306 for Management and Leadership and HMGT 340 for Critical Thinking and Problem Solving. We'll address these low scores with course developers and the faculty who have taught these courses, to identify additional tools or explanations that might help students to be more successful.

## **2. Plan for 2017-2018**

With a new person leading assessment for Health Care Management (Brian Rotty), we'll do some training on TracDat and our Viterbo Assessment Framework. Since this program relies heavily on adjuncts, we'll focus on a program for adjunct training, coordination, communication, recruitment and retention. Assessment work this year, with a faculty member devoted to managing this program's quality, will include deeper investigation into the measures and their alignment with the learning outcomes. We will also attempt to correct the deficiencies in the HMGT 306 and 340 measures that didn't meet the criterion in 16-17.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke**

**Name of Program: Management Information Systems (INFO) Online**

### **1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

Due to low enrollments in the MIS program, the class sizes in all of the INFO courses have been small. In addition, we've noted several courses where there isn't a great deal of distinction in grading, which leads us to believe that rubrics need to be improved and faculty need some additional development related to grade distinction issues.

Overall, all measurements met the criteria requirements for the program this year. We expect some curricular developments in the near future, as we shift some of the focus of this program to data analysis tools and techniques. As a result, new learning outcomes and assessment measures may need to be developed.

## **2. Plan for 2017-2018**

Since the program curriculum may change significantly for fall 2018, we will use the current assessment measures during the 17-18 academic year. However, we will discuss issues of grade distinction and make improvements to rubrics as well. The new curriculum will be measured with new criteria for the 18-19 academic year.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Rochelle Brooks / Alissa Oelfke**  
**Name of Program: Organizational Management (Classroom-based)**

**1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

We are running fewer and fewer classroom-based sections of the OMGT courses as more students have chosen the online format. Most of the measures we were able to take in the 2016-2017 academic year met the criterion requirements. However, one measure in OMGT 400 fell short of the requirements. We moved to a poster presentation in OMGT 400 (Human Resource Management) rather than a research paper as the measurement contributing to the HR Management learning outcome. If we plan to continue to use this new poster assignment, it appears to need some additional development, and the students may need some additional tools in order to be successful in the poster presentation and annotated bibliography.

**2. Plan for 2017-2018**

Assessment work in the 2017-2018 academic year will focus on making sure the master content used in the OMGT courses has up-to-date information regarding the assessment measures. The change outlined above for the OMGT 400 course will need to be updated as part of this process. While conducting this review, we will also re-evaluate the alignment of each of the measures with the program learning outcomes they are intended to measure, and make modifications if the alignment isn't clear.



**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Rochelle Brooks / Alissa Oelfke**  
**Name of Program: Organizational Management (Online)**

**1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

Most of the assessment measures met the criteria requirements during the 2016-2017 academic year. We continue to struggle with meeting the criterion for the OMGT 302 formal business report, which contributes to the Communication learning outcome. Although, in 2016-17, we had 60% of students meet the criterion requirements, which is an improvement over the 48% from the prior year. Our action item for this result is to work with adjuncts on use of the assignment structure, scaffolding, and rubric, and the use of APA formatting, so they can better support students in the writing process.

While reviewing the 16-17 assessment data, we also noted a number of placed where grade distinction was not clear, indicating the need to do some work on rubric development and working with faculty to help them adhere to the scoring rubrics.

**2. Plan for 2017-2018**

Assessment work in the 2017-2018 academic year will focus on development of the formal business report project tools and helping faculty administer the project. In addition, we will focus on further development of rubrics and the use of the rubrics to facilitate greater grade distinction for all measures. Finally, we will re-evaluate the alignment of each of the measures with the program learning outcomes they are intended to measure, and make modifications if the alignment isn't clear.



**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Alissa Oelfke**

**Name of Program: Professional Studies**

### **1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

Due to low enrollments in the PRFS program, the class sizes in the four courses devoted to this major have been small.

Overall, all measurements met the criteria requirements for the program this year, with only one exception, yet many of these measures were used for the first time to analyze the learning outcomes. Only 71% of the students in ORST 495 met the criterion requirements for the literature review and analysis paper, while the goal is 80%. Since there were only 7 students in the class, one additional student reaching 80% would have meant the goal was met. We will review the tools made available to the students for this project, to make sure they are properly supporting the learning outcome.

### **2. Plan for 2017-2018**

Because many of the measures were used for the first time, we'll focus our attention in the 2017-18 academic year on verifying the measures are in close alignment with the program learning outcomes. In addition, we will look at the tools for students in the ORST 495 course, as mentioned above.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

## **2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Business and Leadership Servant Leadership Department**

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Pamela Dixon**

**Name of Program: Master of Arts in Servant Leadership**

### **1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

In 2016-17 a change to the colloquium was made. Instead of a two-course, two-semester capstone sequence, it was modified to consist of one course conducted over one full semester (16 weeks). Further, the focus of the project is an extended literature review on a servant leadership topic relevant to the student's work or community experience. The goal is to focus our efforts on mastery of the literature in servant leadership and align better with how the rest of the curriculum prepares students for colloquium. Further, students will have the flexibility to conduct Action Research, including a robust literature review. The course is currently in session (fall 2017) and the instructor, will obtain formative and summative feedback from students in order to monitor and identify the extent to which this model achieves the goal.

Our Administrative Assessment goal was focused on increasing enrollment and the measure used was graduation rates. It is the intent to change the measurement to include percentages to enrollment increase, the goal being 10% year over year for the next three years. Using a baseline of 38 active enrolled students during fall 2017, our goal will be to achieve 51 actively enrolled students by fall 2020. In order to help streamline measurement and promote retention of actively enrolled students, we'll initiate a cohort model beginning fall 2018. Further, we will implement a course rotation whereby all core courses (SLVD 501, 502, 504, and 690) will occur in the same semester year over year, with the



## College of Education, Science, and Mathematics

### Assessment Report for the College of Education, Science, and Mathematics: Sept. 2017 Updates

School of Education			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up*
IA GRAD: Educational Leadership Program	11/01/2017	11/01/2017	09/22/2014
Master of Arts in Education	09/28/2017	09/26/2017	09/26/2017
Undergraduate Education	09/28/2017	09/20/2016	
WI GRAD: Cross-categorical Special Education License	10/03/2017	09/30/2015	
WI GRAD: Director of Instruction License	09/22/2015	02/16/2016	
WI GRAD: Dir. of Special Ed. & Pupil Services License	09/23/2015	02/16/2016	
WI GRAD: Post Baccalaureate Teacher License	09/28/2017	02/03/2012	
WI GRAD: Principal License	09/22/2017	02/16/2016	
WI GRAD: Reading Specialist License (WI 17)	10/03/2017	09/25/2015	
WI GRAD: Reading Teacher License (WI 316)	10/03/2017	09/29/2015	09/15/2010
WI GRAD: Superintendent License	09/23/2015	02/16/2016	
School of Natural Sciences and Mathematics			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Biochemistry	10/06/2017	10/11/2017	10/11/2017
Biology	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	
Biopsychology	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	
Chemistry	10/06/2017	10/06/2017	10/06/2017
Environmental Biology	10/16/2017	10/16/2017	
Mathematical Physics	05/11/2016	05/11/2016	
Mathematics	10/31/2017	10/31/2017	
Sport Science & Leadership	10/01/2016	10/01/2016	09/01/2011
*Dates are based on information in TracDat as of Fall 2017. The query pulls only the information input into the follow-up section.			

### 2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Education, Science, and Mathematics

#### School of Education

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Carol Page**

**Name of Program: IA GRAD: Educational Leadership Program**

#### 1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

While 100% of our students scored proficient or highly proficient on the Portfolio Presentation Rubric, a common theme emerged in scoring on the presentation section. 20 of 89 presenters scored low on language use. It is clear our students need experience in articulating using professional language. There are three goals for the year: the first is to collaborate with supervisors to revise the current rubric. A robust rubric, with observable indicators, is necessary to ensure scoring fidelity. Inter-rater reliability will be part of this work. Second, I will review course syllabi to ensure a guaranteed and viable curriculum for the Educational Leadership Program. After reviewing syllabi, I will create a curriculum map showing standards, course outcomes, and signature assessments. This document will serve as a collaborative









**Name of Program: WI Grad Post-Baccalaureate Education**

**1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

In 2016-17 we continued efforts to identify and implement authentic assessments of student achievement across the post-bac program, particularly those that indicate student capacity to pass the edTPA assessment. Portfolio submissions have not provided an accurate picture of student performance, as evidenced by the fact that criterion for every learning outcome are consistently met each year, and this data point will no longer be included in our TracDat data submission. New evaluations were implemented for students in field and student teaching placements, for the purpose of gathering more specific and useful assessment data, and continue to be refined as necessary.

As in the undergrad program, we have determined that edTPA data provides valuable information to guide instruction across the post-bac curriculum, as it assesses a student's ability to plan, implement, and assess effectiveness in the prek-12 classroom, as well as the faculty's ability to guide them in mastering skills and abilities in these areas. Since the inception of the edTPA assessment, student performance on Task 2 (instruction) has plateaued at 13.5, and in response we will create a rubric to ensure that we are addressing all components of effective instruction. Efforts to address previously lower scores on Task 3 (assessment) have resulted in improved student performance in this area, resulting in a 100% passing rate on the edTPA portfolio assessment (this is scored by external reviewers).

**2. Plan for 2017-2018**

In 2017-18, we will work alongside the undergrad program in continuing to scrutinize data, ensuring that it provides the information that we need in regard to student learning. We will continue to revise rubrics assessing student performance in the field, and will identify a more effective evaluation of student progress throughout the course of the program than was previously provided by the portfolios submitted for entry to teacher education and student teaching. We have also determined that the student teaching evaluation, which was converted to a Qualtrics survey last year, must be further revised to a more user-friendly and useful format for cooperating teachers.

♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦♦

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Scott Mihalovic**

**Name of Program: WI Principal License (51)**

**1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017**

One Goal from 2016 was to develop a 3rd indicator of success.

Action: Final Reflection paper, one pilot year (2016) and one consequential year in 2017.

Results: Overall 3.81 Average for 5 cohort groups which exceeds the benchmark of 3.6 on a 4 point scale. Second, when broken down by cohort group only one group was below the benchmark, La Crosse was at 3.55.

Program Portfolio Summary:

Action: In 2016 all Essential Questions had been revamped and there are now 6 Essential Questions for each course. There are 42 EQ's in all scored for those who completed the program in 2017.

Results: Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 are all above the 90% benchmark and only standards 5 (89%) and 7 (85%) are slightly below the benchmark, however, both improved from 2016 summary report. Further review by cohort showed the following as it relates to the 90% benchmark: Eau Claire 75% on Standard













## College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

### Assessment Report for the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior: Sept. 2017 Updates

School of Nursing			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up*
Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)	05/24/2016	09/29/2016	04/22/2010
BSN Completion	09/26/2017	09/30/2014	
Graduate Nursing	09/26/2017	09/26/2017	10/26/2016
School of Health and Human Behavior			
Program Name	Date of Last Result	Date of Last Action	Date of Last Follow-up
Criminal Justice	09/08/2017	09/08/2017	09/30/2010
Dietetics	09/14/2017	05/19/2017	05/17/2017
Dietetics Internship	09/29/2016	09/07/2016	
Diversity Studies (minor)	New Program		
Family Studies (minor)	09/28/2017	09/28/2017	
Gerontology (minor)	09/29/2017	10/17/2013	
Master of Science in Mental Health Counseling	09/25/2017	06/26/2017	09/25/2017
Psychology	09/27/2017	09/27/2017	09/21/2017
Social Work	09/22/2017	09/22/2017	06/17/2011
Substance Abuse Counseling	10/20/2017	10/20/2017	10/20/2017
Dates are based on information entered into TracDat as of Fall 2017. The query pulls only the information input into the follow-up section.			

### 2017 Academic Program Assessment Summaries College of Nursing, Health, and Human Behavior

#### School of Nursing

**Name of Assessment Coordinator: Toni Wissestad**

**Name of Program: Nursing BSN**

#### 1. Assessment Results from 2016-2017

Last year we focused on the outcome related to Health Promotion to include disease management and safety principles. The outcomes for Health Promotion were met with some areas for improvement in the following courses: NURS 465 Leadership in Professional Nursing met the criteria however the rubric will be revised to include more rigor/points for the evidence and application to practice, and not as many points for the professional components of the presentation. NURS 332 met the criteria and this course has now been combined with maternity and no longer exists so we will not make further recommendations on this course. NURS 240 met the criteria and the new faculty in this course made significant changes in pedagogy to align the assignment used with the outcomes. NURS 221 met the criteria, however the student skill evaluation form will be revised to better capture and measure this introductory level outcome.

#### 2. Plan for 2017-2018

1. In 2017-2018, we will be collecting results for the learning outcome for Health Care Policy to include policy, finance, and regulations, and will also follow-up on results for Health Promotion.













The Learning Contract data cannot be merged with the explicit curriculum course embedded spreadsheet because the contract reflects the 2015 EPAS. Our benchmark for the Learning Contract is a 3.5/5.0. All students in spring 2017 met the benchmark. See Learning Contract spreadsheet for details.

### **Course Embedded Measures (Explicit Curriculum)**

The following summary highlights competencies and practice behaviors that did not meet benchmark or moved above benchmark in 2016/2017.

#### **Competency 2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles to guide practice. (Competency below benchmark at 79.54)**

EP2.1.2a Recognize and manage personal values. 91.67 (2015/16) to 72.72 (2016/17). Assignment: Ethics paper in capstone.

EP2.1.2b Make ethical decisions. 66.67 (2015/16) to 54.54 (2016/17). Assignment: Ethics paper in capstone.

EP2.2.2d Apply ethical reasoning strategies. 66.67 (2015/16) to 94.4 (2016/17). Rose above benchmark.

#### **Competency 2.1.3 Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgements. Overall Competency at 98.07**

EP 2.1.3c.2 Written communication. 77.80 (2015/16) to 92.31 (2016/17). Rose above benchmark. Assignment: Policy Analysis.

#### **Competency 2.1.4 – Engage in diversity and difference in practice. Overall competency at 84.61.**

EP2.1.4a Recognize oppression. 91.7 (2015/16) to 53.85 (2016/17).

Raw data indicates 6 out of 13 students in the class received grades in the C and BC ranges. Most were just points below. Jennie reviewed rubrics – students who fell below 80% were students that are “weaker” overall (Nikki R., Angela R., Susan T., Taylor M., Andi B., and Cearah K.).

#### **Competency 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social justice. Overall competency at 82.05.**

EP 2.1.5c Advance social and economic justice. 94.4 in (2015/16) to 61.54 (2016/17). Assignment: Advocacy Project.

#### **Competency 2.1.6 Engage in research-informed practice and practice informed research. Overall competency at 63.63.**

EP 2.1.6b Research informed practice. 71.4 (2015/16) to 63.63 (2016/17). Assignment: Research paper. Literature review.

#### **Competency 2.1.10 Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate individuals, families, groups, and communities. Overall competency at 79.48**

EP 2.10.b.3 Goals and Objectives. 76.9 (2015/16) to 53.84 (2016/17). Assignment: Final Case Plan.

EP2.10.d.4 critically analyze and evaluate interventions. 76.90 (2015/16) to 83.3 (2016/17). Assignment: Final Case Plan.

## **2. Identify the program’s primary focus for assessment work for 2017-2018.**

**EP2.1.2a Discussion:** We thought we were not aligning with our grading. We redesigned the rubric to address it and scores went down. Students still not going deep enough with their responses. They can identify on the surface but not go further. Chunk the assignment and go into more detail. Move the timing for this assignment. Cannot have seniors writing this in week 14 of the semester.

**EP 2.1.4a Discussion:** The paper is changing for a new class. We need to see if there are ways. Push for more explicit and directive about diversity and oppression conversations. Helping students process what



Outcome 3 (Ethics): Modify the assignment and grading rubric to require more application of ethical principles and further advance students' ethical thinking.

Outcome 4 (Communication): Use a modified rubric for the oral communication component. Provide additional instruction and feedback for written communication component. Develop and implement assessment method for the interpersonal component of this outcome.

Outcome 5 (Career Assessment): Develop and implement assessment method for this outcome.

