Sustainable Student learning assessment at Ihu

Where we are and recommendations for getting even better
Overview of Student learning assessment at LHU

- Academic Program Student Learning Reporting Progress Over Time
- General Education Student Learning Reporting Progress (more from Ed Bowman)
- Assessment Website Resources
- Assessing the Quality of LHU Academic Program Student Learning Annual Reporting
- Student Learning Improvement Recommended by LHU Faculty
- Examples of Quality Actions in TracDat
- Status on Meeting Assessment Outcome Targets in Academic Programs
- Programs Should Consider How to Improve Learning and Move Past Monitoring Multiple Years
The primary use of student learning assessments is to guide faculty and the University in its efforts to improve student learning of knowledge and skills that are essential for our students to succeed in school and the workplace. Additionally, student learning assessment is one source of data used during annual program reviews and in determining allocation of finances.

Every academic program at LHU is required to participate in assessments of both General Education and Program Student Learning Outcomes. Important information and guidelines concerning these learning assessments can be found in the tabs above.

Where to go for help?

The Outcomes Assessment Committee and Academic Affairs Assessment Council are available to help faculty and programs with assessment of both General Education and Program Learning Outcomes. Questions regarding General Education assessments should be directed to the OAC while questions related to Program Learning Assessment should be directed to the AAAC.

The Flow of Learning Assessment Data & Feedback at LHU

FLOW OF ASSESSMENT DATA & FEEDBACK AT LHU
Assessment

- Office of the Provost
- Accreditation
- Assessment (community)
- Program Review & Annual Reports
- Templates and Rubrics
- TracDat Portal
- TracDat Instructions
- General Education Learning Outcomes
- Four Year G.E. Sampling Rotation
- G.E. Outcomes & Procedures

General Education Learning Trends

3-Year Trends of General Education Assessment Results
- Explanation of Results
- Graphs & Tables for 2011-12 & 2012-13

University Days Faculty Discussion of Assessment Results

The primary use of assessment is to demonstrate the skills that a student has mastered and the data used during the assessment.

Every academic program will have measured student learning outcomes. These outcomes are called Outcomes. Improving these outcomes is the key to what every academic program is about.

Where to go

The Outcomes Assessment website covers both General Education and major program learning outcomes while questions:

The Flow of Assessment
University Days Faculty Discussion of Assessment Results

› Spring 2015 University Days Assessment Results Overview (pdf)
› Spring 2016 University Days Assessment Results Overview (pdf)
› Spring 2015 Faculty Discussion of Gen Ed Assessment Results
› Spring 2016 Faculty Discussion of Gen Ed Assessment Results
› Closing the Loop for Improving General Education Student Learning

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
The primary use of student learning assessments is to guide faculty and the University in its efforts to improve student learning of knowledge and skills that are essential for our students to succeed in school and the work place. Additionally, student learning assessment is one source of data used during annual program reviews and in determining allocation of finances.

Every academic program at LHU is required to participate in assessments of both General Education and Program Student Learning Outcomes. Important information and guidelines concerning these learning assessments can be found in the tabs above.

Where to go for help?

The Outcomes Assessment Committee and Academic Affairs Assessment Council are available to help faculty and programs with assessment of both General Education and Program Learning Outcomes. Questions regarding General Education assessments should be directed to the OAC while questions related to Program Learning Assessment should be directed to the AAAC.

The Flow of Learning Assessment Data & Feedback at LHU
Assessment Report and Actions
Examples from Academic Programs
Criminal Justice, English, Nanotechnology, and Biology
Lock Haven University
Criminal Justice (BS)

Mission: The Department of Criminal Justice at Lock Haven University is dedicated to providing students with the education, skills, perspective and judgment that result from a disciplined program of study covering core content and competencies in the subject matter of crime and justice. Students pursuing the Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice will develop knowledge of issues in the field of criminal justice through a balanced presentation of student learning and program objectives to include: 1) knowledge of the nature and causes of crime and deviance; 2) knowledge of the history and practices of the major organizational systems in criminal justice; and 3) the ability to analyze and critique emerging research and current trends in criminal justice. The criminal justice curriculum will prepare and empower students to be critical thinkers, responsible citizens and to employ ethical perspectives and judgments. Graduates of the Criminal Justice Program will be prepared for professional entry into occupations in the criminal justice system or placement in criminal justice or related graduate programs. (fall 2011)

Assessment Coordinator: Tamson Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Means of Assessment &amp; Criteria / Tasks</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action &amp; Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (BS) - CRJS Student Learning Outcome 1: Application of Knowledge</td>
<td>Specific Assessment: One writing sample for each student enrolled in CRJS 320 Theories of Crime will be evaluated for competency. Assessment Type: Course Assignment(s). Criterion: At least 75% of students evaluated will achieve competency (an assessment score of 75% or better) in the application of theory and examination of punishment using a real crime example. A score of 75% indicates that the student can a) identify the three variables in Routine Activities Theory, b) apply the theory in examination of a real crime incident, c) explain the role and function of sex offender registries in the United States, d) examine the punitive value of sex offender registries within the context of utilitarian punishment philosophy. Related Documents: SOCI 332 - Criminology Theoretical Application Assignment.docx</td>
<td>05/01/2015 - 75% (n=74 of 98 students) of students enrolled in the course for fall 2014 achieved competency as assessed by the rubric for the written assignment. Result Type: Criterion Met Action Status: Action Complete Result Year: AY2014-2015</td>
<td>05/01/2015 - Discussed as faculty. Competency met. No action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Status: Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action & Follow-Up:
05/01/2015 - Discussion was given to examination of instructor bias in use of rubric. I.e., instructor becoming more 'rigorous' in examining student written work for evidence of application of knowledge as articulated in this assignment.

Follow-Up:
09/10/2014 - Discussed with colleagues. Criterion level has been met, even though competency level was raised. Use of rubric in evaluating student work has enhanced assessment accuracies. It is notable that those who did not achieve competency simply did not follow assignment directions.
**Specific Assessment:**

At least 75% of the students evaluated will achieve a score of 70% of better on each of four (4) separate exams. A score of 70% indicates the student has expressed competence in the following areas: a) understanding and application of knowledge of major components of the U.S. Criminal Justice System, b) application of crime measurement, c) evaluation of different models of criminal justice and their impact on the system. Competency is established as a score of at least 70% on each of four different exams of the topic material.

**Assessment Type:**

Course Exam

**Criterion:**

At least 75% of the students evaluated will achieve a score of 70% of better on each of four (4) separate exams. A score of 70% indicates the student has expressed competence in the following areas: a) understanding and application of knowledge of major components of the U.S. Criminal Justice System, b) application of crime measurement, c) evaluation of different models of criminal justice and their impact on the system. Competency is established as a score of at least 70% on each of four different exams of the topic material.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
<td>Overall assessment data for each of the three separate exams (n=152) indicates that: 76% (n=115) of the exams received a percentage score of 70% or greater. Detailed information on competency achievement for each of the exams is presented in the related document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
<td>Competency was achieved, but instructor recommends that &quot;going forward, faculty in the criminal justice department should make sure to reinforce these concepts in other courses so that students are easily able to retain and apply this knowledge in the future.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Follow-Up:**

09/01/2015 - Discussed with course instructor the benefits/drawbacks of 'assessing tests' vs. 'assessing students' across all 4 exams.

**Related Documents:**

- KE CJ102 Exam 1 Fall 2014 (1).docx
- KE CJ102 Exam 2 Fall 2014 1.docx
- KE CJ102 Exam 3 Fall 2014.docx
- KE CJ102 Exam 4 Fall 2014.docx
- Intro Application of Knowledge (2).docx
09/12/2014 - Assessment data for AY 2013-14 was discussed at the department meeting on September 9, 2014. Faculty agreed to continue monitoring the data. Some courses (such as Shakespeare) will require students to develop research projects in clearly defined stages, to ensure greater proficiency selecting and making use of sources.

09/15/2015 - Assessment data was discussed at the department meeting on September 15, 2015. In the past, we have developed actions in response to the comparatively low scores for the outcome of Research. Actions have included designing multi-stage research projects in ENGL336 (Shakespeare). Such assignments will continue to be included in ENGL336, given that the approach appears to have addressed an area of concern.

Specific Assessment:
Students in ENGL205 (Intro to Literary Studies) write a final paper requiring the use of sources. These are evaluated by the course instructor using a rubric that evaluates the students in this area on a scale of 1-3.

Assessment Type:
Course Assignment(s)

Criterion:
70% of students will demonstrate competency or proficiency in the paper used as means of assessment for this Program Student Learning Outcome.

Related Documents:
Rubric, Research, Rhetoric, Writing.doc
Rubric, Research, Rhetoric, Writing.doc

Specific Assessment:
In AY 2011-12, the English Department used multiple, course-based assessments to assess all of our outcomes. For Research, we focused on the following two courses: ENGL205 and ENGL336. In each of these courses, the same rubric was used to assess a specific research-based writing project.

Assessment Type:
Course Assignment(s)

06/30/2014 - The English Department regularly used ENGL205: Introduction to Literary Studies, to assess the student learning outcome of Research. And the other course used for this outcome usually changes annually. For AY 2013-14, ENGL336 (Shakespeare) contributed the second set of assessments for Research. Data indicates that we fell slightly below our target of 70% for this outcome, with 63% of students meeting or exceeding the standard for competency.

Result Type:
Criterion Met

Action Status:
Action In-Progress

Result Year:
AY2013-2014

Related Documents:
Table of Results for Research, Rhetoric, and Writing.doc

06/30/2015 - Two courses, ENGL240 and ENGL336, submitted assessment data for Research, with the data indicating that 85% of students met or exceeded the standard for competency. Thus no action is required; however, the department will have the opportunity to discuss and review this data. Notably, in the past Research has been a comparatively weak areas, which has been addressed by assignments and other pedagogical means.

Result Type:
Criterion Met

Action Status:
No Action Required

Result Year:
AY2014-2015
English (BA) - Writing - English majors will write well, correctly using the conventions of standard written American English and appropriately using the processes involved in developing effective pieces of writing.

**Outcome Types:**
- Academic Program Learning

**Start Date:**
07/01/2009

**Outcome Status:**
Active

**Specific Assessment:**
To assess Writing, the English Department conducted assessments in ENGL205 and ENGL408. The rubric created by the department's assessment committee to address the outcomes of Writing, Rhetoric, and Research, was applied to the work submitted by students in the two specified courses.

**Assessment Type:**
Course Assignment(s)
06/30/2015 - Two courses, ENGL280 and ENGL315, supplied assessment data on Writing, indicating that for each of the four assessed traits, at least 89% of students met or exceeded the standard for competency. Although no actions are required here, the department will discuss and review the data at our September meeting. Additionally, I will recommend tweaking the rubric used for these assessments, so that it is streamlined and more in tune with current research on the best practices for assessing writing.

Result Type: Criterion Met

09/15/2015 - Assessment data was discussed at the department meeting on September 15, 2015. Scores for the outcome of Writing were quite strong. However, the assessment committee has determined that the rubric for writing is a bit unwieldy. Accordingly, the committee will create a new rubric, which should deliver more reliable snapshots of students' performances, in AY2015-16.
Nanotechnology (AAS) - Analytical Skills -
Students in the AAS Program at LHUP will
develop analytical skills (such as theoretical
basis of analytical techniques and judicial
selection and applications of appropriate
analytical techniques for the problem at hand
(e.g. Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy EDX vs
Auger Electron Spectroscopy AES for elemental
analysis).

Outcome Types:
Academic Program Learning

Outcome Status:
Active

Specific Assessment:
Four (4) questions were selected from the
comprehensive final examination and were used
to assess this outcome. We expect student to
have an acceptable knowledge of the theoretical
basis of the techniques used in the course and
have the acceptable capacity to judicially select
analytical techniques given a generic problem in
the disciplines of Nanotechnology and thin films.

Assessment Type:
Course Exam

Criterion:
100% of the students will meet or exceed
expectations.

Related Documents:
Exam Questions

09/01/2015 - There were 10 students in the class with 5
exceeding expectations, 5 meeting expectations while 0
having not meet expectations. Therefore 100% met or
exceeded expectations.

Result Type:
Criterion Met

Action Status:
Action In-Progress

Result Year:
AY2014-2015

09/01/2015 - Overall assessment of the
2015 class shows that the students have
shown good understanding of the
theoretical basis and judicial selection
of the class material and the analysis
techniques / instrumentation. We'll
continue to observe the class, with
regards to assessment and student
improvement.

09/14/2014 - Of the students who took the course 8
exceeded expectations, 2 met expectations and 0 did not
meet expectations. Hence 100% of the students met or
exceeded expectations.

Result Type:
Criterion Met

Action Status:
Action In-Progress

Result Year:
AY2013-2014

09/14/2014 - I. Closing the loop:
Students have continuously performed
well in this outcome.

II. Observations during the current
assessment cycle: Overall assessment of
the 2014 class shows that the students
have shown good understanding of the
theoretical basis and judicial selection
of the class material and the analysis
techniques / instrumentation.

III. Next Action: We will continually
monitor this outcome.
Specific Assessment:
Four (4) questions were selected from the comprehensive final examination and were used to assess this outcome. We expect students to have an acceptable knowledge of the theoretical basis of the techniques used in the course and have the acceptable capacity to judiciously select analytical techniques given a generic problem in the disciplines of Nanotechnology and thin film.

Assessment Type:
Course Exam

Criterion:
100% of the students will meet or exceed expectations.

Related Documents:
Exam Questions

Specific Assessment:
This learning outcome was assessed in the PHAP 300 Thin Film Science and Technology course. Laboratories of PHAP 300 course were so designed to enhance the understanding of thin film/nano technological systems and develop technical skill of using appropriate instrumentation. Completion of each laboratory requires student using relevant instrumentation and a comprehensive written lab report. These student submitted lab reports, and in the laboratory, hands on observation of student’s competency of handling instrument at the end of laboratory sessions was observed and assessed by the professor. A rubric was used to assess the lab reports.

Assessment Type:
Laboratory Assignment
01/2015 - There were 10 students in the class with 5 exceeding expectations, 5 meeting expectations while 0 not meeting expectations. Therefore 100% met or exceeded expectations.

Result Type: Criterion Met
Action Status: Action In-Progress
Result Year: AY2014-2015

09/01/2015 - Overall assessment of the 2015 class shows that the students have shown good understanding of the theoretical basis and judicial selection of the class material and the analysis techniques / instrumentation. We’ll continue to observe the class, with regards to assessment and student improvement.

14/2014 - Of the students who took the course 8 exceeded expectations, 2 met expectations and 0 did not meet expectations. Hence 100% of the students met or exceeded expectations.

Result Type: Criterion Met
Action Status: Action In-Progress
Result Year: AY2013-2014

09/14/2014 - I. Closing the loop: Students have continuously performed well in this outcome.
II. Observations during the current assessment cycle: Overall assessment of the 2014 class shows that the students have shown good understanding of the theoretical basis and judicial selection of the class material and the analysis techniques / instrumentation.
III. Next Action: We will continually monitor this outcome.

09/01/2015 - of the 10 students who took the class, 5 exceeded expectations, 4 met expectations and 1 did not meet expectations. Thus 90% met or exceeded expectations.

Result Type: Criterion Met
Action Status: Action In-Progress
Result Year: AY2014-2015

09/01/2015 - From last year the cohort of students using Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) has improved. This is probably due to revising the lecture focused on the instrument and the revising the lab instructions. Students found some difficulties in improving the skills of AFM/STM and Four Point Probe. Students found the operating the other equipment relatively easier to learn. Increased focus on the AFM/STM, and Four Point Probe with revising the two lab write-ups focused on each of these instruments. We will continue to monitor the progress of the students in this class in relation to the learning outcome assessment.
09/01/2015 - of the 10 students who took the class, 5 exceeded expectations, 4 met expectations and 1 did not meet expectations. Thus 90% met or exceeded expectations.

Result Type: Criterion Met
Action Status: Action In-Progress
Result Year: AY2014-2015

09/01/2015 - From last year the cohort of students using Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) has improved. This is probably due to revising the lecture focused on the instrument and the revising the lab instructions. Students found some difficulties in improving the skills of AFM/STM and Four Point Probe. Students found the operating the other equipment relatively easier to learn. Increased focus on the AFM/STM, and Four Point Probe with revising the two lab write-ups focused on each of these instruments. We will continue to monitor the progress of the students in this class in relation to the learning outcome assessment.
### Specific Assessment:
Beginning Fall 2014, writing assessments is conducted in BIOL107 (PoB II), and upper level Biology courses as identified

**Assessment Type:**
Course Assignment(s)

**Criterion:**
70% of students will obtain an overall competency score of 2 using the University WC rubric.

**Results:**
10/13/2015 - BIOL107 - Spring 2015, 78% of students (N = 9) scored 2 or better using the University WC rubric.
BIOL409 - Spring 2015, 90% of students (N = 20) scored 2 or better using the University WC

**Result Type:**
Criterion Met

**Action Status:**
No Action Required

**Result Year:**
AY2014-2015

### Specific Assessment:
Beginning Fall 2014 questions asking students to

**Results:**
09/18/2015 - Fall 2014 BIOL106 PoB I, 69% of Biology majors (N = 26) scored 70% or better on the

**Generated by TracDat a product of Nuventive.**
Where do we go from here?

- New drop down boxes in TracDat
- Faculty Discussion of General Education Learning Results (see Assessment website)
- Quality of Assessment Plans and Reporting (see Assessment website)
- Programs should monitor the percent of student learning targets met each year to determine if any changes are needed (see Assessment website)
- TracDat has two versions more recent than the one we are using and we will be determining if and when we can move to the latest version and use the latest tools within TracDat.
The primary use of student learning assessments is to guide faculty and the University in its efforts to improve student learning of knowledge and skills that are essential for our students to succeed in school and the workplace. Additionally, student learning assessment is one source of data used during annual program reviews and in determining allocation of finances.

Every academic program at LHU is required to participate in assessments of both General Education and Program Student Learning Outcomes. Important information and guidelines concerning these learning assessments can be found in the tabs above.

Where to go for help?

The Outcomes Assessment Committee and Academic Affairs Assessment Council are available to help faculty and programs with assessment of both General Education and Program Learning Outcomes. Questions regarding General Education assessments should be directed to the OAC while questions related to Program Learning Assessment should be directed to the AAAC.

The Flow of Learning Assessment Data & Feedback at LHU