

Annual Report on Assessment and Curriculum Change – June 1, 2009

Prepared by Sharon Dwan and David Reinhold

Introduction:

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from May 1, 2008 until April 30, 2009. Two sets of data are included in this report. The first divides the curriculum changes into three categories.

- A. Curriculum changes resulting from assessment
- B. Curriculum changes that were required by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies.
- C. Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

The second table breaks the curriculum changes down by type. This includes three different categories.

- A. Academic program changes
- B. Substantial course changes
- C. Miscellaneous course changes

Academic program changes include such things as the introduction of new programs, revision of existing programs, deletion of programs, or changes in admission or graduation requirements within a program. Substantial course changes include such things as introduction of new courses, changing the credit hours, prerequisites, or changing the enrollment restrictions or level of a course. Miscellaneous course changes include deletion of courses, changing the title and/or description of a course or changing the course number. The numbers in parentheses in these even numbered tables represent the number of changes that were based upon assessment results.

This report first gives the data for the entire university and then breaks it down by colleges. In addition, the data for each college is broken down by department.

Cumulative University Results:

There were 396 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Two hundred and fifty-two were at the undergraduate level and 143 at the graduate level. In addition, one proposal was submitted to change the name of the College of Education to the College of Education and Human Development. One hundred and twenty-seven of the curriculum changes (32.1%) were the result of assessment of student learning. Further analysis shows that 42.5% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning while only 14.0% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment.

At the undergraduate level, over half of the proposed changes (57.5%) were substantial course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 16.7% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 25.8%. As might be expected, over half (55.4%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 42.1 % of the substantive course changes and only 23.8% of the

miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. This pattern is expected since academic program changes are the most dramatic and presumably require the greatest input prior to being proposed. Likewise, one would expect that assessment plays a bigger role in substantial course changes than in miscellaneous course changes. This indeed is the case.

The results at the graduate level were similar to the undergraduate changes in that substantial course changes accounted for more of the proposals (62.9%) than either academic program changes (16.8%) or miscellaneous course changes (20.3%). As with the undergraduate curriculum changes, assessment played the greatest role in academic program changes (37.5%), a lesser role in substantial course changes (11.1%) and had the least effect on miscellaneous course changes (3.4%).

College of Arts and Sciences:

The college had 125 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 64 at the graduate level for a grand total of 189 curriculum changes. Table 1 shows that 29.6% of the undergraduate changes and 15.6% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. The types of assessment tools used for data gathering included standardized exams, proficiency essays, student surveys, focus groups, and comprehensive exams. In all, 24.9% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment.

Table 1 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
AFS	6			6				0
ANTH			2	2				0
A&S	2			2	1			1
BIOS			6	6			1	1
CHEM				0			1	1
COM	3	2	17	22	2		1	3
ECON				0			2	2
ENGL	3			3				0
GEOG	10		9	19	2		4	6
GEOS	2		6	8				0
GLOBAL STU	1			1				0
HIST	5		8	13	2			2
LANG			21	21				0
PHIL				0			18	18
PHYS	3		1	4				0
PSCI	2		1	3	1		3	4
PSY			10	10		4		4
PADM				0			1	1
SCI ED				0			6	6
SOC				0	1		9	10
SPAN				0			4	4
STAT				0	1			1
WMS			5	5				0
Total	37	2	86	125	10	4	50	64

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment

B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization

C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 2 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 28.0% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 54.4% were substantial course changes, and 17.6% were miscellaneous course changes.

Table 2 – Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
AFS		6(6)		6(6)				0
ANTH	1	1		2				0
A&S	1(1)	1(1)		2(2)		1(1)		1(1)
BIOS		6		6		1		1
CHEM				0		1		1
COM	13(2)	7(1)	2	22(3)	1(1)	1(1)	1	3(2)
ECON				0	2			2
ENGL	2(2)	1(1)		3(3)				0
GEOG	8(8)	9(1)	2(1)	19(10)	1(1)	3(1)	2	6(2)
GEOS	2(1)	2(1)	4	8(2)				0
GLOBAL STUDIES			1(1)	1(1)				0
HIST	1(1)	5(4)	7	13(5)	2(2)			2(2)
LANG	3	18		21				0
PHIL				0		18		18
PHYS	1	3(3)		4(3)				0
PSCI	1(1)	2(1)		3(2)	1(1)	2	1	4(1)
PSY		6	4	10	1	3		4
PADM				0			1	1
SCI ED				0	1	5		6
SOC				0	2	7	1(1)	10(1)
SPAN				0		4		4
STAT				0	1(1)			1(1)
WMS	2	1	2	5				0
Total	35(16)	68(19)	22(2)	125(37)	12(6)	46(3)	6(1)	64(10)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

Assessment was responsible for 45.7% of the academic program changes, 27.9% of the substantial course changes, and 9.1% of the miscellaneous course changes. This data is

consistent with the idea that assessment results are used more often when significant changes in curriculum are developed.

The data for the graduate programs show that 18.8% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 71.9% were substantial course changes, and 9.4% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in making 50.0% of the academic program changes, 6.5% of the substantial course changes, and 16.7% of the miscellaneous changes.

College of Aviation:

The College of Aviation had six curriculum changes for the year, one of which was based upon assessment of the writing ability of their students (see Table 3). Table 4 shows that 5 of the 6 curriculum proposals were substantive course changes with one of these being based on the writing assessment. The remaining curriculum proposal was a miscellaneous course change. It should be noted that the college does not have any graduate programs.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

A	B	C	Total Number
1		5	6

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment

B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization

C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 4 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

A	B	C	Total Number
	5(1)	1	6(1)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

Haworth College of Business:

The college had 15 curriculum changes, all at the undergraduate level. Table 5 shows that 86.7% of the proposals were due to assessment. Two thirds of the changes (10) were submitted as a result of changes within the Integrated Supply Matrix Management Program. Eight of these ten changes were based upon the assessment procedures of the Integrated Supply Management Executive Council. The tools used by the council were not defined in the proposal. Other assessment based changes were the result on input from alumni and employers as well as national data.

Table 5 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	
ACTY	2			2
BIS	1			1
BUS	2		1	3
FCL	1			1
MGMT	5			5
MKTG	2		1	3
Total	13		2	15

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment

B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization

C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 6 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The only two proposals that were not assessment driven were substantial course changes.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	
ACTY	1(1)	1(1)		2(2)
BIS			1(1)	1(1)
BUS	2(2)	1		3(2)
FCL		1(1)		1(1)
MGMT	1(1)	4(4)		5(5)
MKTG		3(2)		3(2)
Total	4(4)	10(8)	1(1)	15(13)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

College of Education:

The college had 42 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 34 at the graduate level for a grand total of 76 curriculum changes. The data in Table 7 shows that 52.4% of the undergraduate changes were due to assessment of student learning, while only 14.7% of the graduate changes were assessment based. Student, alumni and employer surveys, student projects, and instructor evaluations were used as assessment tools. In all, 35.5% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment. The College of Education also had a significant number of changes that were dictated by accreditation standards (28.6% of the undergraduate changes and 33.3% of the graduate changes). If these accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then 81.0% of the undergraduate curriculum proposals and 52.9% of the graduate curriculum proposals were based on either assessment data or accreditation requirements. It should be noted that the data in Table 7 does not include one proposal to change the name of the college from the College of Education to the College of Education and Human Development.

Table 7 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CECP			2	2	2	2	6	10
SPLS				0		1		1
FCS	10	9	4	23	1		5	6
HPER	12	3	2	17	1	10	5	16
TLES					1			1
Total	22	12	8	42	5	13	16	34

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment

B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization

C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 8 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 21.4% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 57.1% were substantial course changes and 21.4% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment played a role in about 50% of proposals in each category. The data for the graduate programs show that 20.6% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 32.4% were substantial course changes and 47.1% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in making 42.9% of the academic program changes, 18.2% of the substantial course changes and not used to make any of the miscellaneous course changes.

Table 8 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			Total Number
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	
CECP		1	1	2	3(2)	4	3	10(2)
SPLS			0	0		1		1
FCS	6(3)	15(7)	2	23(10)	2	4(1)		6(1)
HPER	3(1)	8(6)	6(5)	17(12)	2(1)	1	13	16(1)
TLES						1(1)		1(1)
Total	9(4)	24(13)	9(5)	42(22)	7(3)	11(2)	16	34(5)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

College of Engineering and Applied Sciences:

The college had 20 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 19 at the graduate level for a grand total of 39 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that 30.0% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment while only 10.5% of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Most of the assessment reported was surveys of students, alumni and employers as well as recommendations from advisor boards. One proposal (ENGR) measured student performance.

Table 9 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE			1	1			7	7
CS			2	2				0
ECE				0			4	4
ENGR	1		2	3				0
IME	5		3	8			2	2
MAE		1	1	2			2	2
ME		1	3	4	2			2
PAPR				0			2	2
Total	6	2	12	20	2	0	17	19

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment

B = Number of assessment changes that were initiated due to an outside organization

C = Number if curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 10 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 35.0% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 45.0% were substantial course changes, and 20.0% were miscellaneous course changes. Most of the academic program changes (71.4%) were based upon assessment while only 11.1% of the substantive course changes were assessment based. None of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment result. The data for the graduate programs show that 15.8% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 73.7% were substantial course changes and 10.5% were miscellaneous course changes. None of the academic program changes nor any of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results while 14.3 % of the substantive course changes were proposed because of assessment.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CCE			1	1	1	6		7
CS		1	1	2				0
ECE				0	2	2		4
ENGR		3(1)		3(1)				0
IME	7(5)		1	8(5)		2		2
MAE		1	1	2			2	2
ME		4		4		2(2)		2(2)
PAPR				0		2		2
Total	7(5)	9(1)	4	20(6)	3	14(2)	2	19(2)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

College of Fine Arts:

The college had 27 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and one at the graduate level for a grand total of 28 curriculum changes. The majority of the changes (21) were due to the Theater Department changing three BA degrees (Performance, Stage Management, and Design and Technical Theater) to BFA degrees. The data in Table 11 show that 77.8% of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment while the one graduate curriculum proposal was not based upon assessment. Many of the proposals from the Theater Department, which make up the vast majority of the curriculum changes, cited the 2007 – 2008 departmental assessment summary as the primary motivation for the changes submitted.

Table 11 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ART				0			1	1
DANC	2		2	4				0
MUS			1	1				0
THEA	19		3	22				0
Total	21		6	27	0	0	1	1

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment

B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization

C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 12 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change and shows that 33.3% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 51.9% were substantive course changes and 14.8% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment accounted for the majority of the academic program changes (77.8%) and the substantive course changes (85.7%). Exactly half of the undergraduate miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. The one graduate proposal was a substantive course change and was not based upon assessment.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
ART				0		1		1
DANC	2	2(2)		4(2)				0
MUS			1	1				0
THEA	7(7)	12(10)	3(2)	22(19)				0
Total	9(7)	14(12)	4(2)	27(21)	0	1	0	1

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

College of Health and Human Services:

The college had 17 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 25 at the graduate level for a grand total of 42 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that 41.2% of the undergraduate changes and 12.0% of the graduate proposals were based upon assessment data. The types of assessment tools used for data gathering included formal student feedback, student evaluations, employer surveys and direct measurement of learning outcomes.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total number
NUR	3			3				0
OT	2		2	4				0
PA			5	5			12	12
SPPA	2		2	4	3	4	6	13
SW			1	1				0
Total	7	0	10	17	3	4	18	25

A = Number of curriculum changes resulting from assessment

B = Number of curriculum changes that were initiated due to an outside organization

C = Number of curriculum changes that were not the result of assessment

Table 14 shows that most of the undergraduate proposals (88.2%) were substantive course changes, with only one academic program change and one miscellaneous course change. Assessment was only a factor in the substantive course changes (46.7% due to assessment results). Results were somewhat similar for the graduate curriculum changes in that most (72.0%) were substantive course changes. Academic program changes accounted for 8.0% of the graduate proposals and the remaining 20.0% were miscellaneous course changes. Again, none of the academic program changes or the miscellaneous course changes were based on assessment results, while 16.7% of the substantive course changes were assessment based.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
NUR		3(3)		3(3)				0
OT		4(2)		4(2)				0
PA	1	4		5	1	10	1	12
SPPA		4(2)		4(2)	1	8(3)	4	13(3)
SW			1	1				0
Total	1	15(7)	1	17(7)	2	18(3)	5	25(3)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

Summary:

Several observations can be made from the 2008 – 2009 data. First, most of the assessment that results in curriculum changes appears to be indirect. Departments across the colleges rely heavily on surveys of various groups, focus groups and recommendations of various boards. There are only a few cases where direct measurement of student learning has led to curriculum changes. Although it appears assessment has begun to be incorporated into the campus culture, departments may need help in designing and using tools to directly measure what students learn. This may be a future task of the University Assessment Steering Committee. It should be noted, however, that not all assessment tools used by departments in making curriculum changes have been identified. Since the curriculum change form does not specifically ask for the tools used, many proposals simply state that the change was based on assessment results without any further explanation.

Second, there is still confusion on what is intended by question 10 on the curriculum change form (question asking if the change was due to assessment of student learning). There were multiple examples in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Education, the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, and the College of Health and Human Services in which departments explained how the change would add to their assessment plan, not whether the change was due to assessment results. Other proposals explained how the change would help students' progress through the program. Although this could be considered a type of assessment, it does not directly address the question of whether measurement of student learning was the impetus for the change.

Finally, there is a trend in the results that shows assessment seems to be more prevalent at the undergraduate level than in graduate programs. As stated earlier, 42.5% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning while only 14.0% of the graduate changes were assessment based. With the exception of the College of Education, this same trend was observed last year. This may also be a topic of discussion for the University Assessment Steering Committee.