

SUMMARY REPORT:
STUDENT LEARNING
OUTCOMES

GWYNEDD MERCY UNIVERSITY

AY2011 to AY2017

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT--ACADEMIC
AY2011-2012

Legend

Exceeds <i>All criteria met</i>	Meets <i>-1 criteria</i>	Below <i>-2 or more criteria</i>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------

ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR <i>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</i>						
	College-Level	Program-Level	Course-Level	Use of Results	Communication	Participation Rate
Criteria	1. On Schedule; 2. Faculty-Driven; 3. Plan/Report Complete; 4. Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence for all programs	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Programs meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Courses meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. Next Steps identified 2. Use of Data 3. Changes as result	1. Whole College 2. PT Faculty 3. School-Level 4. Program-Level 5. Student-Level	1. 95%-100% FT Faculty/Staff 2. Includes PT faculty 3. Includes students
AY2011-2012	Communication <i>(Met Criteria 1,2,3,4)</i>	35 <i>(Met Criteria 1,2,3,4,5,6,7)</i>	3 <i>(Met Criteria 1,2,3,4,5,7)</i> Not Met: (6)	<i>(Met Criteria 1, 2, 3)</i>	<i>(Met Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4)</i> Not Met: (5) Note: No systematic communication to students	<i>(Met Criteria 1, 2, 3)</i>
Next Steps: Set more realistic goals for # of courses to assess each year; Create communication tools to use with students: newsletter, course-imbedded communication, student advisory board updates						

College -Level Yes
Program- Level Yes
Course- Level Yes

HIGHLIGHTED Learning Outcomes ASSESSMENT RESULTS

2011-2012 Academic Year																																			
	College-Level	General Education						Program-Level	Course-Level																										
Summary of Significant Findings	Evidence of students' attainment of "Communication skills" at acceptable levels. However, students enrolled at CLL locations assessed at lower levels for the criteria for communication of "content" for associate's level courses.	Gen Ed Program could not define "Distinctive Mercy Graduate." Uneven evidence of Writing Intensive Signature Courses.						Writing Quality measures were below expectations for 7 out of the 8 program-level assessments that focused specifically on measuring writing quality of graduating seniors.	Assessment results from four courses serve as samples to compare the quality of learning occurring at CLL to that of students enrolled at the main campus.																										
		Signature Course Syllabi Review – Random Sample																																	
			SOC2000	ENG2001	SCI2000	RS2000	HIS2000			PHI2000																									
			N=5	N=7	N= 3	N=6	N=5			N=5																									
		Evidence of writing intensive	83%	100%	100%	67%	40%			60%																									
		Evidence of Mercy	100%	29%	100%	17%	20%			60%																									
<p>NUR415</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section</th> <th>Analysis Paper/Rubric</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>EN27</td> <td>✓</td> <td>94.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FM23</td> <td>✓</td> <td>89.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EN22</td> <td>✓</td> <td>90.55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PL21</td> <td>✓</td> <td>89.22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DKMain</td> <td>✓</td> <td>92.33%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Conclusion: Comparable Next Steps: Already licensed nurses enrolled in course; No specific next steps necessary</p> <p>SCI2000</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section</th> <th>% Academic Dishonesty Reports</th> <th>Test Item Analysis</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Public Ledger</td> <td>67% (4/6) plagiarized [CHECK THIS NUMBER FOR ACCURACY]</td> <td>Item #1: 57% Correct Short Essay: 17% Correct</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Main Campus</td> <td>10% submitted plagiarized essays [CHECK THIS NUMBER FOR ACCURACY]</td> <td>Item #1 72% Correct Short Essay: 30% Correct</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Conclusion: Not Comparable Next Steps: Increase ARC support; Communicate requirements for academic integrity; Need for remediation for first semester students.</p> <p>SOC2000</p>									Section	Analysis Paper/Rubric	Percentage	EN27	✓	94.7%	FM23	✓	89.1%	EN22	✓	90.55%	PL21	✓	89.22%	DKMain	✓	92.33%	Section	% Academic Dishonesty Reports	Test Item Analysis	Public Ledger	67% (4/6) plagiarized [CHECK THIS NUMBER FOR ACCURACY]	Item #1: 57% Correct Short Essay: 17% Correct	Main Campus	10% submitted plagiarized essays [CHECK THIS NUMBER FOR ACCURACY]	Item #1 72% Correct Short Essay: 30% Correct
Section	Analysis Paper/Rubric	Percentage																																	
EN27	✓	94.7%																																	
FM23	✓	89.1%																																	
EN22	✓	90.55%																																	
PL21	✓	89.22%																																	
DKMain	✓	92.33%																																	
Section	% Academic Dishonesty Reports	Test Item Analysis																																	
Public Ledger	67% (4/6) plagiarized [CHECK THIS NUMBER FOR ACCURACY]	Item #1: 57% Correct Short Essay: 17% Correct																																	
Main Campus	10% submitted plagiarized essays [CHECK THIS NUMBER FOR ACCURACY]	Item #1 72% Correct Short Essay: 30% Correct																																	

				<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Section</th> <th>Portfolio Assignment</th> <th>Success Rates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>E. Norriton</td> <td>✓</td> <td>80-100% Exceed/Meet</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Main Campus</td> <td>✓</td> <td>80-100% Exceed/Meet</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Conclusion: Comparable</p> <p>BUS101</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Proficient</th> <th>Benchmark Met</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>E. Norriton</td> <td>50%</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Main Campus</td> <td>57%</td> <td>No</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Conclusion: Comparable/ Not Desirable Next Steps: Increase ARC support; Provide placement/remediation for first semester students.</p> <p>BUS4000</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Simulation Exam</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>E Norriton</td> <td>6/9 goals met</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Main</td> <td>7/9 goals met</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Conclusion: Comparable Next Steps: Fine tune course content</p>	Section	Portfolio Assignment	Success Rates	E. Norriton	✓	80-100% Exceed/Meet	Main Campus	✓	80-100% Exceed/Meet	Location	Proficient	Benchmark Met	E. Norriton	50%	No	Main Campus	57%	No	Location	Simulation Exam	E Norriton	6/9 goals met	Main	7/9 goals met
Section	Portfolio Assignment	Success Rates																										
E. Norriton	✓	80-100% Exceed/Meet																										
Main Campus	✓	80-100% Exceed/Meet																										
Location	Proficient	Benchmark Met																										
E. Norriton	50%	No																										
Main Campus	57%	No																										
Location	Simulation Exam																											
E Norriton	6/9 goals met																											
Main	7/9 goals met																											
Use of Results	IOAC members recommended that additional tutors be hired for CLL locations. Accomplished	The Gen Ed Committee is drafting standards for Writing Intensive and staging larger conversations designed to more effectively articulate the definition for "Distinctive Mercy Graduate"	Insertion of writing quality measures into Academic Plan; VPAA required "Writing Intensive" definition and standards from EPP and Gen Ed Committee.	Provide Placement/ Remediation for ASBA students at CLL locations. Increase ARC support at off-campus locations.																								
Communication of Results	General Assembly (S2012)	General Assembly Gen Ed Com IOAC	General Assembly Program-level faculty groups IOAC	Program-level faculty School of Business																								

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT--ACADEMIC
AY2012-2013

Legend

Exceeds All criteria met	Meets -1 criteria	Below -2 or more criteria
-----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------

ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR <i>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</i>						
	College-Level	Program-Level	Course-Level	Use of Results	Communication	Participation Rate
Criteria	1. On Schedule; 2. Faculty-Driven; 3. Plan/Report Complete; 4. Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence for all programs	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Programs meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Courses meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. Next Steps identified 2. Use of Data 3. Changes as result	1. Whole College 2. PT Faculty 3. School-Level 4. Program-Level 5. Student-Level	1. 95%-100% FT Faculty/Staff 2. Includes PT faculty 3. Includes students
AY2012-2013	Professional Competency (Met Criteria 1, 2, 3) Not Met: No direct evidence for some programs such as HIS, ENG, PHI (4)	18 Met Criteria 1,2,3,4,5,6,7	32 +unknown Nursing Met Criteria 1,2,4,5,6 Not Met: (3) some reports are due in Aug; (7) quality uneven b/c need to incorporate course-level data such as success rates, grade distributions; course SLOs not available for every course	(Met Criteria 1,2,3)	(Met Criteria 1,2,3,4) Not Met: (5) No systematic communication to students	(Met Criteria 1, 2,3)
Next Steps: Develop more thorough course-level assessment that includes "effectiveness" data; Coordinate revisions of course-level SLOs; Set a deadline of end-of-May for all Course Reports; Create an "Assessment Communication Plan"						

College Level Assessment **Yes**
 Program Level Assessment **Yes**
 Course Level Assessment **Yes**

2012-2013 Academic Year				
	College-Level	General Education	Program-Level	Course-Level
Summary of Significant Findings	<p>30 out of 34 Programs (88%) were able to provide evidence of satisfactory attainment of "Professional Competency."</p> <p>Of the 4 Programs not able to provide this evidence: 1 Philosophy provided definition; 1 Medical Lab Tech is 2+2 program; 1 program suspended; 1 Psychology program used final examination as best approximation</p>	<p>One of the most significant results of ERC review of program data: The # of Signature Courses are negatively affecting the # of electives offered by key majors.</p>	<p>A&S (Course Assessment Only Year)</p> <p>BUS NUR/HP</p> <p>BUSINESS Challenges noted in...</p> <p>Improvements noted in ...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased # of internships 2. APA formatting and research writing skills due to decision to introduce APA formatting in BUS1010 and for changes made to the assigning smaller projects in BUS321, allowing feedback for each section of the final research project. The results indicated that this yielded better student learning results, with 72% of students achieving at least proficiency, 	<p>76% Course-level assessments met or exceeded Quality Criteria for assessment (Based on results from rubric applied to current sample May 29, 2013: 16/21; assessment reports are still being turned in)</p> <p>Number of Courses Assessed met Target Goal of 100? No (Conclusion: too aggressive target for course assessment; reduce number per academic year, but maintain broad coverage of programs. Focus on the assessment of identified "gateway" courses)</p> <p>95% developed appropriate "next steps"</p>

			<p>exceeding the benchmark.</p> <p>NURSING/HP RN to BSN</p>																																		
<p>Use of Results</p>	<p>The IOAC agreed to draft revised criteria for the “Professional Competency” student learning outcome in order to create a more measurable definition.</p>	<p>Gen Ed Committee members redesigning the Gen Ed Program to incorporate a more flexible system of Signature Courses.</p>	<p>BUSINESS</p> <p>Next Steps: Because the programs were not in separate tracks before 2012, the assessment data is not aggregated by program. For the next assessment cycle, the individual program outcomes for each separate major will be assessed</p> <p>NURSING/HP RN to BSN:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Abstract / Results</p> <p>*Blue Highlight indicates special focus: <i>online/F2F or accelerated/traditional</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="972 451 1923 1424"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="972 451 1098 532">School/ Course</th> <th data-bbox="1098 451 1507 532">Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings</th> <th data-bbox="1507 451 1923 532">One Highlighted Example of an Identified Action Step</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="972 532 1923 573">A&S</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="972 573 1098 678">BIO421</td> <td data-bbox="1098 573 1507 678">66% Below For experimental design 66% Met/Exceeded Proper calculations</td> <td data-bbox="1507 573 1923 678">Provide more information stressing difference in experimental design, experimental protocol and the importance of statistical analysis of data</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="972 678 1098 760">BIO203</td> <td data-bbox="1098 678 1507 760">63.8%, 90% Mastering Biology question averages compared to non-Mastering Biology averages of 5.9% and 56.7%</td> <td data-bbox="1507 678 1923 760">Continue using the online MasteringBiology resource but re-assess its effectiveness</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="972 760 1098 914">BIO107</td> <td data-bbox="1098 760 1507 914">Comparison with/without “case study” assignment: Without: 53% in F2011 earned B or higher With: 83% earned B or higher F2012</td> <td data-bbox="1507 760 1923 914">Intervention considered successful. Because is a service course for Nursing, the case study approach helps students succeed in later nursing coursework.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="972 914 1923 954">CHM151</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="972 954 1098 1092">CIS101</td> <td data-bbox="1098 954 1507 1092">40% material covered at CLL locations compared to Main Campus. 59% Final Average for CLL 89% Final Average for Main</td> <td data-bbox="1507 954 1923 1092">Learning not comparable between campuses/accelerated compared to traditional ; Proposal submitted to VPAA for the CLL course be extended to 7 weeks.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="972 1092 1098 1198">CIS 4000</td> <td data-bbox="1098 1092 1507 1198">Portfolio Review Met standards for content Below standards for professional quality</td> <td data-bbox="1507 1092 1923 1198">Sample size of 1 too small to be generalized. CIS students to be required to save evidence for their portfolios.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="972 1198 1923 1239">COM203</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="972 1239 1098 1352">CRJ220</td> <td data-bbox="1098 1239 1507 1352">For “Ethics understanding” 20% Exceed 72% Meet 8% Below</td> <td data-bbox="1507 1239 1923 1352">Devote less time on ethics in course and increase coverage of criminal justice system.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="972 1352 1098 1424">CRJ326</td> <td data-bbox="1098 1352 1507 1424">Presentations 92% Exceed/Meet 8% Below</td> <td data-bbox="1507 1352 1923 1424">No changes recommended</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School/ Course	Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings	One Highlighted Example of an Identified Action Step	A&S			BIO421	66% Below For experimental design 66% Met/Exceeded Proper calculations	Provide more information stressing difference in experimental design, experimental protocol and the importance of statistical analysis of data	BIO203	63.8%, 90% Mastering Biology question averages compared to non-Mastering Biology averages of 5.9% and 56.7%	Continue using the online MasteringBiology resource but re-assess its effectiveness	BIO107	Comparison with/without “case study” assignment: Without: 53% in F2011 earned B or higher With: 83% earned B or higher F2012	Intervention considered successful. Because is a service course for Nursing, the case study approach helps students succeed in later nursing coursework.	CHM151			CIS101	40% material covered at CLL locations compared to Main Campus. 59% Final Average for CLL 89% Final Average for Main	Learning not comparable between campuses/accelerated compared to traditional ; Proposal submitted to VPAA for the CLL course be extended to 7 weeks.	CIS 4000	Portfolio Review Met standards for content Below standards for professional quality	Sample size of 1 too small to be generalized. CIS students to be required to save evidence for their portfolios.	COM203			CRJ220	For “Ethics understanding” 20% Exceed 72% Meet 8% Below	Devote less time on ethics in course and increase coverage of criminal justice system.	CRJ326	Presentations 92% Exceed/Meet 8% Below	No changes recommended
School/ Course	Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings	One Highlighted Example of an Identified Action Step																																			
A&S																																					
BIO421	66% Below For experimental design 66% Met/Exceeded Proper calculations	Provide more information stressing difference in experimental design, experimental protocol and the importance of statistical analysis of data																																			
BIO203	63.8%, 90% Mastering Biology question averages compared to non-Mastering Biology averages of 5.9% and 56.7%	Continue using the online MasteringBiology resource but re-assess its effectiveness																																			
BIO107	Comparison with/without “case study” assignment: Without: 53% in F2011 earned B or higher With: 83% earned B or higher F2012	Intervention considered successful. Because is a service course for Nursing, the case study approach helps students succeed in later nursing coursework.																																			
CHM151																																					
CIS101	40% material covered at CLL locations compared to Main Campus. 59% Final Average for CLL 89% Final Average for Main	Learning not comparable between campuses/accelerated compared to traditional ; Proposal submitted to VPAA for the CLL course be extended to 7 weeks.																																			
CIS 4000	Portfolio Review Met standards for content Below standards for professional quality	Sample size of 1 too small to be generalized. CIS students to be required to save evidence for their portfolios.																																			
COM203																																					
CRJ220	For “Ethics understanding” 20% Exceed 72% Meet 8% Below	Devote less time on ethics in course and increase coverage of criminal justice system.																																			
CRJ326	Presentations 92% Exceed/Meet 8% Below	No changes recommended																																			

				ENG105	First Quarter: 28% higher score on post-test than pre-test Second Quarter: 15% higher on post-test than on pre-test	Require ARC session early on for struggling students; increase formative assessments
				ENG230	<i>Exam and Essay Analysis:</i> <i>Online Section</i> 46% (6/13) Exceed 46% (6/13) Met 8% (1/13) Below <i>F2F Section</i> 54% (7/13) Exceed 31% (4/13) Met 15% (2/13) Below	Results were similar between online and F2F student learning outcomes
				HIS2000	Critical Understanding 11% Exceed 51% Meet 38% Below Demonstrate critical approach 5% Exceed 46% Meet 49% Below	Students expect to rely on memorization and have difficulty recognizing the dynamic nature of historical understanding that allows the past to remain relevant today (quotation from report)... Instructor will present the final exam question to students at the beginning of semester.
				HIS131	Identify/locate primary sources 11.5% Exceed 19.2% Meet 69.2% Below Identify/locate secondary sources 65.5% Exceed 23.1% Meet 11.5% Below Prepare a written commentary 63.5% Exceed 7.6% Meet 30.8% Below	Develop new assignments for students to use that help them locate primary sources
				MTH303	Online 86.6% F2F 90.9%	A small difference, but not statistically significant. Because the online MTH303 had been offered for the first time, and, therefore, may not be fully developed, the next step is to continue the monitoring of the comparison of online with F2F.
				MTH002	Final Exam Questions 41.9% = Below Benchmark for "Solve Quadratic"	Students performed well on straightforward arithmetic computations and its applications. Group did poorly on quadratic

					equation problem. For those students progressing to next math course that requires algebra, these students will need to develop more fully their abstract levels of thinking.	
				PSY100	<p>Assessment of the coverage of content material by all instructors: Physiology, Cognition, Memory/Learning 100% Meet Expectations Social 80% Meet Human Development 60% Meet Emotion, Personality 20% Meet</p>	<p>Program Director will provide guidelines for new/continuing instructors on what topics should be addressed across the semester and to what extent.</p> <p>Revise course learning outcomes.</p>
				PSY150	<p>Rated PSY 150 1-4 minute Videos</p> <p>Knowledge 66% Meet/Exceed ; 33% Below Creativity 99% Meet/Exceed Relevance 99% Meet/Exceed Script 66% Meet/Exceed; 33% Below</p>	<p>Instructor should continue to provide students with a clear rubric on the req'd contents of the assignment</p> <p>Instructor should provide examples of outstanding videos from prior classes. This will provide more specific and concrete guidance as they prepare their own projects.</p>
				PSY200	<p>Assessment of whether instructors (5 PT, 1FT) collective group of exams addressed each of the four major aspects of development (physical, cognitive, emotional and psychosocial) across eight stages of human development (prenatal, infancy, early childhood, middle childhood adolescence, young adulthood, middle adulthood, late adulthood).</p> <p>Results indicate that the majority of instructors addressed emotional and psychosocial issues across most of the age ranges (with some minor deficits), whereas most failed to address physical and cognitive development across the lifespan</p>	<p>Program Director provide guidelines for new and continuing instructors on the overall topic areas to be addressed throughout the semester</p> <p>Program Director will discuss the issue that Education majors do not currently take PSY100 with the Dean of School of Education to determine if (1) education majors should be required to take PSY100, and/or (2) all education majors can be put in a specific section of PSY200 which is tailored to their knowledge level in this area.</p>
				PSY314		
				SOC201	<p>Students write positive, measurable time limited treatment plans: 83% Exceed/ Met 17% Below</p>	<p>Recommend providing additional time to assure students understanding the importance as well as the process of measureable treatment goals.</p>
ARC						

				*Math Modules	Pretest 36% average score Posttest 77% average score	Develop a longitudinal study of student success rates after Math Modules.
				*Writing Center	Students unable to recognize terms such as coherence, syntax, unity and voice. Consistently confused references to the "writing Process as synonymous with the "tutoring process".	Develop a more comprehensive training program for the tutors stressing the writing process
BUS						
				BUS101	APA Assessment 44% Mastery 28% Proficient 0% Approaching 22% Unacceptable Writing Assessment 0% Mastery 0% Proficient 28% Approaching 72% Unacceptable	Increase # of whole-class reviews of APA formatting Break research paper into multiple, smaller assignments so that students will be able to improve in each area as the semester continues instead of relying on a single summative assessment of the final research paper.
EDU						
				EDU100	Assessment of Writing Mechanics 0% Exceed 25% Meet 75% Below Content 50% Exceed 50% Meet 0% Below Structure 13% Exceed 75% Meet 13% Below Overall 0% Exceed 88% Meet 13% Below	Undergraduate faculty are participating in the college's WAC initiative and are implementing specific strategies culled from the college-level writing workshops
				SPE205	Before/After ARC Support	Let ARC know of the results in improvement in "mechanics." However, not a similar increase in the qualities of "structure."

					Before Arc: 0% Exceed Mechanics; 20% Meets; 80% Below After ARC: 60% Exceed Mechanics; 40% Meets; 0% Below	
				EDU601	APA formatting 86% Exemplary Methodology, Analysis 100% Exemplary	Continue to refine instructional approaches to teach APA formatting
				EDU583	70% exceed/meet expectations for Literature review	Modify the course to require a capstone project rather than a literature review.
				EDU581	Service Plan met expectations <i>75% satisfactory job of identifying the pros and cons of inclusion, describing the Gaskin Agreement, and identifying the principles of IDEA 04.</i> <i>25% somewhat successful job meeting the various learning outcomes</i>	No changes recommended
				NUR/HP		
NEXT STEPS/ TO DO	1. Revise University ULOs	1. Reduce # of Signature Courses 2. Define DMG 3. Define and implement "Writing Intensive" 4. Begin Writing Across the Disciplines initiative 5. Support E-Portfolio use within Gen Ed Program courses to help with assessment process				

Communication	General Assembly (S2013)	Response to ERC and VPAA (F2013)	School Meetings/ Deans and Faculty	School & Division meetings
----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT -- ACADEMIC

AY2013-2014

Legend

Exceeds All criteria met	Meets -1 criteria	Below -2 or more criteria
-----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------

ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR <i>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</i>						
	University-Level	Program-Level	Course-Level	Use of Results	Communication	Participation Rate
Criteria	1. On Schedule; 2. Faculty-Driven; 3. Plan/Report Complete; 4. Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence for all programs	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Programs meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Courses meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. Next Steps identified 2. Use of Data 3. Changes as result	1. Whole College 2. PT Faculty 3. School-Level 4. Program-Level 5. Student-Level	1. 95%-100% FT Faculty/Staff 2. Includes PT faculty 3. Includes students
AY2013-2014	Leadership (Met Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4)	18 Met Criteria 1,2,3,4,5, ,7 Not Met 6 (NUR program assessment reports not complete by deadline)	20 +unknown Nursing Met Criteria 1,2,4,5,6 Not Met: 7 (course SLOs not available for every course)	(Met Criteria 1,2,3)	(Met Criteria 1,2,3,4) Not Met: (5) No systematic communication to students	Met
Next Steps						
University Level Assessment Yes Program Level Assessment Yes Course Level Assessment Yes						

2013-2014 Academic Year								
	University-Level	General Education	Program-Level	Course-Level				
<p>Summary of Significant Findings</p>	<p>Review of the PLOs revealed only 7/34 (21%)academic undergraduate programs indicated clearly articulated learning outcomes aligned with ULO for “Leadership”</p> <p>Student perception indicator (SLRS results) indicated that University weighted averages were at or above the national weighted averages</p> <p>“Service” is not required in our existing academic programs.</p>	<p>(No assessment due to efforts toward complete revision of Gen Ed Program. Gen Ed Taskforce attended the AAC&U General Education and Assessment Institute in Vermont and designed new structure for Gen Ed Program)</p>	<p>HIS/BIO/CIS/HUM/PSY/PHI/COM/CRJ/LLFA—No Program-Level Assessment required, only Course-Level</p> <p>ENG and MTH: Developmental ENG and MTH Success rates of students were examined. Findings: 84% Success Rate of Deve Students in College Level ENG</p> <p>81% Success Rate of Non-Dev Students in College level Eng</p> <p>65% Success Rate of Dev Students in College Level MTH</p> <p>81% Success Rate of DevStudents in College Level MTH</p> <p>BUS—Preparation for IACBE Self Study</p> <p>EDU— ERC Program Review Year</p> <p>NUR/HP-</p>	Abstract / Results				
				School/ Course	Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings	One Highlighted Example of an Identified Action Step		
				A&S				
				ENG050	Student Success Rates 84% of Developmental Students are successful in College Level ENG – compared to 81% of Non-Developmental Students	Determine if students who did not continue to College-Level ENG course were retained by college		
				HIS131	<p><u>For Assignment A,</u> (Section DA): Only 8 out of 11 (72.7%) students completed this assignment, with the following results: 1= 6; 2=5; 3=5; 4=5. (Section EA): Only 3 out of 7 (42.8 %) students completed this assignment with the following results: 1=0; 2=2; 3=2; 4=3.</p> <p><u>For Assignment B,</u> (Section DA): Only 10 out of 11 (90.9%) students completed this assignment, with the following results: 1=10; 2=5; 3=10; 4=7; 5=8; 6=7; 7=6; 8=7.</p>	The assessment results obtained from these particular activities indicate that greater emphasis must be placed upon making students aware of the value of and the need to locate and effectively use historical sources. New assignments must be developed and greater emphasis placed upon training students in research methods before the full benefit of program and course learning outcomes can be achieved.		
BIO111L	Majority of students exceeded/met standards on all case studies and exams	Because the lab practical exam indicated only 35% exceed standards (remaining met standards), the instructor will change practice and offer potential practical questions to familiarize students with the type of questions, content and techniques they will be required to know.						
BIO114	Comparison of individual genetics homework grades with the item	Instructor will reach out to students underperforming on the homework and invite them to a problem-solving session						

				BIO251 /251L	Item analysis of Exam 1 indicated that topics of "Meiosis"(50% of students successfully answer) "epistasis"(58.3% success) and "Polygenic Inheritance" (50% success) were the only ones with lower than 70% success rates.	Grant more review time of topic of meiosis along with the genetics problems. Instructor needs to re-evaluate the pacing of the material in the course to ensure that content in the fourth quarter of the class is not rushed due to lack of time or cancellations due to weather.
				CIS	**No Report due to staffing changes	
				SOC201	Four question Likert scale questionnaire administered at the end of the semester seems to indicate strongly that guest speakers were very helpful in helping students understand the field and feel certain about their choice of the major. Listening to fellow students talk about their brief field experiences was also useful, but not as strongly as the guest speakers. Open comments all indicate that the students found the class useful and enlightening on the human service field.	Since the data collected was basically positive, the information will be used to reinforce teaching methods presently used. Possibly add some structure to the student presentations to make them equally useful to the guest speakers.
				MTH050	Student Success Rates 65% of Dev Students success in College Level MTH compared to 81% Success Rate for Non-Dev Students	Students seem to be waiting more than one semester before taking next MTH course. Advisors should encourage taking course s in very next semester
				PSY211	100% of students met or exceeded the criteria for Critical Concepts (60% met, 40% exceeded) and 100% met or exceeded the criteria for Critical Thinking (40% met, 60% exceeded). The three faculty reviewers agreed that the majority of students appeared to understand the assignment clearly and put effort into a thoughtful and accurate report.	Based on the results of the PSY 211 assessment, the faculty has agreed that the assignment should continue, and that this is one means of promoting student engagement with course content both in and outside of the classroom.
				COM400	The results showed that students were better at crafting a single story than understanding their beat as a whole. Learning the beat may require more consistent effort than most were willing to put in. The did not cultivate wide sets of sources or pay continuing attention to what was happening on the beat and subsequently had a hard time coming up with story ideas to pitch at editorial meetings. This difficulty was then reflected again in their responses to the question	From the results of this assessment, future instructors may wish to consider how to compel deeper involvement between students and their beat. This might include more exercises in story origination. It also might include a stronger editorial hand by the professor in terms of assigning stories he considers most important and worthwhile over driving them to toward self-motivation which may be lacking among students. It could also include a step-by-step approach in which students do more

					about current issues on the beat in the final brief. However, once assigned a story, students were competent in reporting it and posting it to the website often with photo illustration.	reporting exercises prior to filing the first story and/or start with a profile of a key figure on the beat.
				CRJ	**No Report	
				BUS		
					**Preparation for IACBE Review	
					SEE IACBE Assessment Report	
				EDU		
					**NA—No Course-Level Assessment during ERC Review year	
				NUR/HP		
Use of Results	<p>IOAC revised the ULO for leadership</p> <p>IOAC will establish a standing focus group for exiting seniors.</p> <p>IOAC will continue to refine and revise the remaining ULOs</p> <p>IOAC is clarifying criteria for “Service and civic learning”</p>	<p>Replace the Signature Courses with Signature Seminars</p> <p>Conduct training of faculty regarding Writing Intensive</p>				
NEXT STEPS / TO DO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a standing focus group for graduating seniors 2. Revise the ULOs to reflect current emphases and degree-levels 3. Support design of an institution-wide E-Portfolio 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess the newly designed Signature Seminar 2. Continue conversations describing DMG and assess at 1st, 	Refine Program Level Data Reports so that quantitative information is more easily tracked.			

	system so can collect evidence for all ULOs	mid- and end points for students' perceptions 3. Assess "Writing Intensive" standards as applied to Sig Seminars 4. Investigate E-Portfolios		
Communication	General Assembly Spring 2014	General Assembly S2014 School Meetings SAST	School Meetings	

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT -- ACADEMIC

AY2014-2015

Legend

Exceeds All criteria met	Meets -2criteria	Below -3or more criteria
-----------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR <i>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</i>						
	University-Level	Program-Level	Course-Level	Use of Results	Communication	Participation Rate
Criteria	1. On Schedule; 2. Faculty-Driven; 3. Plan/Report Complete; 4. Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence for all programs	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Programs meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Courses meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. Next Steps identified 2. Use of Data 3. Changes as result	1. Whole College 2. PT Faculty 3. School-Level 4. Program-Level 5. Student-Level	1. 95%-100% FT Faculty/Staff 2. Includes PT faculty 3. Includes students
AY2014-2015	"Moral and Ethical Reasoning" MET: 1, 2, 3, 4	MET: (1, 2, 4) NOT MET: (5)insufficient involvement of PT faculty; (3, 6) NUR and EDU reports incomplete	MET: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 NOT MET: 1, 3	MET: 1, 2, 3	MET: 1, 3, 4 NOT MET: 2, 5	MET: 1, 2 NOT MET 3
Next Steps: Find a software company that can help with collecting/reporting data for EDU and NUR programs and courses						
University Level Assessment	Yes					
Program Level Assessment	Yes					
Course Level Assessment	Yes					

2014-2015 Academic Year																																					
	University-Level	General Education	Program-Level	Course-Level																																	
Summary of Significant Findings	<p>“Moral and Ethical Reasoning”</p> <p>DIT2 Results: From Capstone courses</p> <p>Students tested at higher levels for moral/ethical reasoning skills than national means:</p> <p>DIT2 RESULTS:</p> <p>GMercyUMean N=19 38.94</p> <p>Nat’IMean for Seniors N=12207 35.97</p> <p>Pattern analysis of data gathered from 111 Faculty/Staff indicated the following frequencies of common descriptors:</p>	<p>AAC&U Plan for Revision of Gen Ed Program – Progress to-date <i>Exceeds Standards</i></p> <p>Writing Intensive Definition – Rubric developed</p> <p>Signature Seminars— Rubric developed</p> <p>FYE Assessment – National data compiled and reviewed to determine if University FYE structure is aligned. Conclusion: Yes</p> <p>Distinctive Mercy Graduate – Assessment results from qualitative review of data by DMG Taskforce members identified the following qualities:</p> <p>Seeing the Need (recognition, not blind, not averting your eyes)</p> <p>Justice (economic justice, social responsibility, diversity)</p> <p>Action (Mercy isn’t about what we believe, it is about what we do; practice in field, serve locally, advocate globally)</p> <p>Relational (Care of all creation “we belong to ourselves, yet we belong</p>	<p>BIO/CIS/COM/CRJ/ENG/HIS/HUM/MTH/PHI/PSY/LLFA—All programs assessed as part of ERC Review for Program Effectiveness</p> <p>BUS—Assessment Plan for Program-level learning outcomes was completely re-designed based on new IACBE guidelines and requirements. IACBE reviewed and accepted the revised assessment plan. IACBE reaccreditation achieved (7 years)</p> <p>EDU—All programs established revised assessment plans that were more completely aligned with PDE competencies in preparation for the PDE Major Review.</p> <p>HP— RadTech – Licensure Rates and Employment Rates MET standards</p> <p>RadTherapy—Licensure Rates and Employment Rates MET Standards</p> <p>NUR—The ASN monitoring report was accepted by ACEN;</p>	<p>Abstract / Selected Results</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School/ Course</th> <th>Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings</th> <th>One Highlighted Example of an Identif Action Step</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">A&S</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to Program-Level Review Process for Education Review Committee</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">BUS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to Program-Level Review Process for IACBE</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">EDU</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to preparation of Program-Level Assessment Plans for PDE</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">NUR/HP</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BSN</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>MSN</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>DNP</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School/ Course	Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings	One Highlighted Example of an Identif Action Step	A&S				**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to Program-Level Review Process for Education Review Committee		BUS				**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to Program-Level Review Process for IACBE		EDU				**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to preparation of Program-Level Assessment Plans for PDE		NUR/HP			BSN			MSN			DNP		
				School/ Course	Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings	One Highlighted Example of an Identif Action Step																															
				A&S																																	
					**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to Program-Level Review Process for Education Review Committee																																
				BUS																																	
					**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to Program-Level Review Process for IACBE																																
				EDU																																	
					**NA—Course-Level assessment not required due to preparation of Program-Level Assessment Plans for PDE																																
				NUR/HP																																	
				BSN																																	
MSN																																					
DNP																																					

		<p>to others"; care for others) Key Qualities (courage, persistence, wisdom, respect, joy, compassion, pragmatic)</p> <p>25% of graduating students' answers regarding the DMG MET Standards.</p>	<p>The Systematic Evaluation Plan was revised to include more precise assessment evidence and benchmarks;</p>	
<p>Use of Results</p>		<p>Writing Intensive: Rubric will be applied to courses submitted as Sig Seminars beginning in F2015 ; Faculty were provided training on writing intensive practices (Writing Across Disciplines) through the Mini Grant applied for and won. Regionally recognized expert provided a training session for 40 faculty members. 2 follow-up sessions scheduled for June and August</p> <p>Signature Seminars: Rubric is being designed</p> <p>Distinctive Mercy Graduate: The results from the assessment process are being used to further develop and norm description of DMG. FYE will be redesigned to more carefully incorporate the DMG.</p>		

<p>NEXT STEPS/ TO DO</p>	<p>1. Revise ULOs establishing clearer criteria for “exceed standards” for degree levels (associates, bachelors, masters, doctoral) 2. MISSION: Set up meeting between IOAC and Mercy & Values Committee to discuss alignment of ULOs with Mission/Mercy VALUES. 3. Investigate institution-wide adoption of E-Portfolios</p>	<p>1. Investigate program adoption of E-Portfolios for assessment of Gen Ed PLOs 2. Continue conversations and story-sharing around “Distinctive Mercy” 3. Continue with implementation of Writing Intensive requirements and creation of Graduate Seminar. Assess effectiveness in AY2016-2017 4. Revise Gen Ed PLOs to reflect the newly revised structure/writing standards</p>	<p>1. NUR: a.) Hire a temporary PT staff position to assemble the data . b.) Establish a faculty member as the Director for NUR Assessment and Compliance . c.) Refine the Course Information tool to help streamline the information and condense the time needed to fill out the information. d.) Operationalize an out-sourced Program-Level Graduate, Alumni, Employer Survey instrument (Investigating vendor: EBI) HP: Collect the assessment information submitted to Program-Level Accrediting Agencies 2. A&S: ERC Review 3. EDU: All Campuses: Operationalize the newly revised EDU Program-Level assessment plans beginning this Aug 2015 EDU: 4. GPS ONLINE: Establish Online Assessment Taskforce to create an ONLINE Program Assessment Plan and Report due May 2016 5. BUS: a.) Refine and collect the Course-Level</p>	
---------------------------------	--	--	--	--

			<p>Learning Outcomes. b.) Establish Curriculum Maps for BUS programs</p> <p>6. MISSION: Set up meetings with program directors and Mission & Values Committee to discuss alignment of PLOs with MISSION/Mercy VALUES</p> <p>7. Increase involvement with PT faculty through newsletters, inclusion in assessment activities</p>	
<p>Communication</p>	<p>Gen Assembly S2015</p> <p>Academic Committee of the Board S2015</p> <p>Board of Trustees S2015</p>	<p>Gen Assembly S2015</p> <p>Academic Committee of the Board S2015</p> <p>Board of Trustees F2014</p> <p>School Meetings S2015</p>	<p>School Meetings</p>	

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT -- ACADEMIC

AY2015-2016

Legend

Exceeds All criteria met	Meets -2criteria	Below -3or more criteria
-----------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR <i>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</i>						
	University-Level	Program-Level	Course-Level	Use of Results	Communication	Participation Rate
Criteria	1. On Schedule; 2. Faculty-Driven; 3. Plan/Report Complete; 4. Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence for all programs	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Programs meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Courses meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. Next Steps identified 2. Use of Data 3. Changes as result	1. Whole College 2. PT Faculty 3. School-Level 4. Program-Level 5. Student-Level	1. 95%-100% FT Faculty/Staff 2. Includes PT faculty 3. Includes students
AY2015-2016	"Moral and Ethical Reasoning" MET: 1, 2, 3, 4	MET: (1, 2, 4) NOT MET: (5)insufficient involvement of PT faculty;	MET: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 NOT MET: 1, 3	MET: 1, 2, 3	MET: 1, 3, 4 NOT MET: 2, 5	MET: 1, 2 NOT MET 3
Next Steps: Refine and revise the assessment schedule for all program-level assessment and course-level assessment						
University Level Assessment	Yes					
Program Level Assessment	Yes					
Course Level Assessment	Yes					

2015-2016 Academic Year																																																							
	University-Level	General Education	Program-Level	Course-Level																																																			
Summary of Significant Findings	<p>Mission Assessment Findings: 66% of undergraduate programs specifically articulated a Mercy-related learning outcome; 60 % of graduate programs</p> <p>Revisoning year for ULOs. Drafted new ULOS for faculty review and vote</p>	<p>The goal of the General Education program is to create a “Distinctive Mercy Graduate”.</p> <p>The FYE course was reworked to more completely include Distinctive Mercy discussions and assignments. Results from assessment of redesigned FYE end assignment essays: 100% of FYE students submitting essays were able to identify the Distinctive Mercy Graduate</p>	<p>PHL—Comparison of enrollment with SEPCHC consortium indicates that all programs in the region have declined in enrollment.</p> <p>HUM—Rubric applied to portfolios. Results: MET standards</p> <p>EDU Programs— Results of Major Review by PDE: All Undergraduate Programs APPROVED.</p> <p>Graduate Programs APPROVED <i>MS Special Education-- PENDING</i></p> <p>NUR Programs— Preparing Self Study for CCNE</p>	<p>Abstract / Results</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School/ Course</th> <th>Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings</th> <th>One Highlighted Example of an Identif Action Step</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3">A&S</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BIO</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CIS</td> <td>(Search for Primary Professor)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Criminal Justice</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>COM</td> <td>(Revised Course Learning Outcomes)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>HIS</td> <td>(Revised Course Learning Outcomes)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>ENG</td> <td>N<5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>PSY435</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">BUS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>(Revised Course Learning Outcomes) SEE Assessment Plan for IACBE</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">EDU</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>SEE Major Review Results for PDE</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">NUR/HP</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>SEE NUR “Course Reports”</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School/ Course	Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings	One Highlighted Example of an Identif Action Step	A&S			BIO			CIS	(Search for Primary Professor)		Criminal Justice			COM	(Revised Course Learning Outcomes)		HIS	(Revised Course Learning Outcomes)		ENG	N<5		PSY435			BUS				(Revised Course Learning Outcomes) SEE Assessment Plan for IACBE		EDU				SEE Major Review Results for PDE		NUR/HP				SEE NUR “Course Reports”							
				School/ Course	Highlighted Examples of Assessment Findings	One Highlighted Example of an Identif Action Step																																																	
				A&S																																																			
				BIO																																																			
				CIS	(Search for Primary Professor)																																																		
				Criminal Justice																																																			
				COM	(Revised Course Learning Outcomes)																																																		
				HIS	(Revised Course Learning Outcomes)																																																		
				ENG	N<5																																																		
				PSY435																																																			
				BUS																																																			
					(Revised Course Learning Outcomes) SEE Assessment Plan for IACBE																																																		
				EDU																																																			
					SEE Major Review Results for PDE																																																		
				NUR/HP																																																			
	SEE NUR “Course Reports”																																																						
NEXT STEPS	Continue asking Program Directors to	Continue efforts of integrating DMG within	Refine and simplify the Assessment Schedule	Refine the rotational Assessment Schedule for Course OutcomesAssessment																																																			

	<p>refine the PLOs in order to reflect Mercy values and critical concerns.</p> <p>Re-assess Writing skills of graduating seniors through Grammarly.</p> <p>Design and Implement a University Data Book</p>	<p>graduate programs—special focus at GPS locations</p> <p>Design and Implement a Program Data Book</p>	<p>for Program Outcomes for A&S</p> <p>Refine the Key Indicator Reports for all programs</p>	
<p>COMMUNICATIONS</p>	<p>Academic Committee of the Board F2015 S2016</p> <p>Board of Trustees S2016</p> <p>General Assembly S2016</p>	<p>S2016 Spring General Assembly</p> <p>Program Directors</p>		

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT -- ACADEMIC

AY2016-2017

Legend

Exceeds All criteria met	Meets -2criteria	Below -3or more criteria
-----------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR <i>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</i>						
	University-Level	Program-Level	Course-Level	Use of Results	Communication	Participation Rate
Criteria	1. On Schedule; 2. Faculty-Driven; 3. Plan/Report Complete; 4. Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence for all programs	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Programs meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Courses meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. Next Steps identified 2. Use of Data 3. Changes as result	1. Whole College 2. PT Faculty 3. School-Level 4. Program-Level 5. Student-Level	1. 95%-100% FT Faculty/Staff 2. Includes PT faculty 3. Includes students
AY2016-2017	Revision of ULOs "Written Communication" Met Criteria, 1, 2, 4 Not Met Criteria 3	Met Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 Not Met Criteria 5, 6	Met Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 Not Met Criteria 5, 6	Met Criteria 1, 2 Not Met Criteria 3	Met Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 Not Met Criteria 3, 5	Met Criteria 1 Not Met Criteria 2, 3
Next Steps:						
University Level Assessment Yes						
Program Level Assessment Yes						
Course Level Assessment Yes						

2016-2017 Academic Year				
	University-Level	General Education	Program-Level	Course-Level
Summary of Significant Findings	<p>March 2017, General Faculty voted and approved the revised ULOs that are based on AAC&U Leap VALUE Outcomes. (Vote Results: 41 Yes; 2 No; 1 Abstain)</p>	<p>Members of the General Education Committee came to consensus that the revised ULOs will replace the original General Education Learning Outcomes.</p>	<p>A&S Programs: Redesigned the Assessment Plan Template and instituted a twice-yearly A&S Assessment Meeting: May and August. SWK—Developed draft Assessment Plan to meet CSWE requirements; OT/OS—Developed draft Assessment Plan to meet ACOTE requirements</p> <p>BUS Programs: Successful submission of IACBE Assessment Report</p> <p>NUR Programs: Successful submission of CCNE Self Study—including NUR Assessment Reports for the past 3 years.</p> <p>HP Programs: Submission of CoARC Self Study for Respiratory Therapy; Submission of CoARC Self Study for Radiation Therapy.</p> <p>EDU Programs: Began training for CAEP requirements related to Assessment. Developed draft Assessment Plan aligning PDE/INTASC Standards.</p>	<p>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) – Identified for all NUR courses, all HP courses, some A&S courses, all GPS courses, most BUS courses</p>
NEXT STEPS	<p>Deans requested a 1-year transition to the revised ULOs for all syllabi</p> <p>Redesign the IOAC to serve as an institutional method of “Assessing Assessment”</p> <p>Identify the KPIs for the Institution</p>	<p>Determine a Curriculum Map aligning the new outcomes with courses within the Gen Ed Program.</p> <p>Develop a Gen Ed Assessment Plan to assess for: quantitative reasoning, information literacy, oral communication skills, written communication skills, technology skills</p> <p>Develop a Gen Ed Curriculum Map identifying the courses that fulfill each program’s required distributions.</p>	<p>Continue to refine the Assessment Plan Template for clarity of results and ease of use.</p> <p>Provide the Program Directors with lists of student names--those who graduated and those who are not retained-- for their tracking the results.</p> <p>Revise the Program-Level PostGraduate Student Satisfaction Survey to meet accreditation requirements and to provide more fully realized data</p> <p>Identify the Key Performance Indicators for every Academic Program</p>	<p>Continue collection of CLOs for every discipline</p>
COMMUNICATIONS	<p>SAST Meeting S2017</p> <p>Academic Council Meeting</p>	<p>Gen Ed Committee Mtg</p> <p>Academic Council Mtg</p>		<p>BUS School Meeting</p>

	Deans Council Meeting Academic Affairs Committee of the Board S2017 Executive Council S2017			
--	---	--	--	--

ASSESSMENT SUMMARY REPORT -- ACADEMIC

AY2017-2018

Legend

Exceeds All criteria met	Meets -2criteria	Below -3or more criteria
-----------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR <i>Assessing Student Learning Outcomes</i>						
	University-Level	Program-Level	Course-Level	Use of Results	Communication	Participation Rate
Criteria	1. On Schedule; 2. Faculty-Driven; 3. Plan/Report Complete; 4. Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence for all programs	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Programs meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. On schedule 2. Faculty-Driven 3. Plan/Report Complete 4. Both Direct Evidence and Indirect Evidence collected 5. FT and PT 6. # of Courses meets goal set 7. Quality of Reports	1. Next Steps identified 2. Use of Data 3. Changes as result	1. Whole College 2. PT Faculty 3. School-Level 4. Program-Level 5. Student-Level	1. 95%-100% FT Faculty/Staff 2. Includes PT faculty 3. Includes students
AY2017-2018						
Next Steps:						
University Level Assessment	Yes					
Program Level Assessment	Yes					
Course Level Assessment	Yes					

2017-2018 Academic Year				
	University-Level	General Education	Program-Level	Course-Level
Summary of Significant Findings				
NEXT STEPS				
COMMUNICATIONS				