

ASSESSMENT AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2017 - 18



August 3, 2018

Prepared by:

Dave Reinhold

Kelley Oliver

Tonya Dean

INTRODUCTION

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

Two sets of data are included in this report. The first divides the curriculum changes into four categories:

- A. Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.
- B. Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.
- C. Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.
- D. Curriculum changes that do not fall into any of the categories above.

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

- A. Academic program changes
- B. Substantive 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. Substantive 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 the even numbered tables represent the number of changes that were based upon assessment of student learning. For the purpose of this report, only changes made based on either the indirect or the direct measurement of student learning are counted as assessment based. This is consistent with the definition used by the Higher Learning Commission.

This report provides data for the whole university, each of the seven colleges and their departments.

CUMULATIVE UNIVERSITY RESULTS

There were 373 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. One hundred and eighty-six were at the undergraduate level and 181 at the graduate level. There were also one department name change, one creation of an institute and four accelerated graduate degree program proposals. Twenty-nine of the curriculum changes (7.8%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 10.8% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 5.0% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment. This is the same as last year in that more assessment driven changes were made at the undergraduate level.

Overall, assessment data was used most often in making academic program changes. The data show that 9.8% of academic program changes were based on assessment of student learning while 7.7% of the substantive course changes and 2.9% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, more than half of the proposed changes (50.5%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 11.3% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 38.2%. Slightly less than 1/10 (9.9%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 12.8% of the substantive course changes and 4.5% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Unlike last year, assessment played the biggest role in substantive course changes.

The results at the graduate level were similar to the undergraduate curriculum changes in that substantive course changes accounted for more of the proposals (70.2%) than either academic program changes (22.7%) or miscellaneous course changes (7.2%). Unlike the undergraduate changes, however, assessment played the largest role in academic program changes (9.8%) followed by substantive course changes (3.9%). There were no miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level due to assessment of student learning.

It should be noted that all curriculum proposals involving 5000 level courses (substantive or miscellaneous) were viewed as changes in the graduate curriculum. In addition, proposals that had both miscellaneous and substantive changes to courses were only recorded under the substantive course change category. Finally, all 373 proposals were used to calculate percent of

CUMALATIVE UNIVERSITY RESULTS

proposals due to assessment of student learning. Proposals that affected both undergraduate and graduate courses/programs were not omitted from the calculation.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The College of Arts and Sciences had 71 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 67 at the graduate level. Four curriculum changes involved accelerated graduate degree programs and were not included in either the undergraduate or the graduate numbers. There was also one department name change and one creation of an institute that were not included in either the undergraduate or graduate change. Thus, the total number of proposals was 144.

Table 1 shows that 12.7% of the undergraduate changes and 4.5% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 8.3% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment.

Table 2 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 53.5% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 39.4% were substantive course changes, and 7.0% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was responsible for 7.9% of the academic program changes, 21.4% of the substantive course changes, and none of the miscellaneous course changes.

The data for the graduate programs show that 34.3% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 59.7% were substantial course changes, and 6.0% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 13.0% of the academic program changes and none of the substantive course changes or miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Table 1 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
AAAS				1	1					0
CAS				1	1					0
CHEM		5		3	8				1	1
COM				2	2		1			1
ECON				1	1				5	5
ENGL				3	3				2	2
ENVS				2	2					0
GEOG			1	11	12				8	8
GEOS	1			3	4	1		1	5	7
HIST				1	1				2	2
INTL				1	1					0
MATH				2	2		1			1
MDVL				1	1					0
MISE					0				10	10
PHIL					0				1	1
PHYS	1			5	6				1	1
PSY	1			5	6				15	15
SOC			1	1	2				3	3
SPAA				4	4					0
SPAN					0				1	1
STAT				1	1				5	5
WLL		1		12	13				4	4
Total	3	6	2	60	71	1	2	1	63	67

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Table 2 – Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Total Number
	A	B	C		
AAAS		1			1
CAS	1				1
CHEM	3	5(5)			8(5)
COM	2				2
ECON	1				1
ENGL		3			3
ENVS	1		1		2
GEOG	7	3	2		12
GEOS	2(1)		2		4(1)
HIST		1			1
INTL		1			1
MATH	2				2
MDVL	1				1
MISE					0
PHIL					0
PHYS	3	3(1)			6(1)
PSY	3(1)	3			6(1)
SOC		2			2
SPAA	4				4
SPAN					0
STAT	1				1
WLL	7(1)	6			13(1)
Total	38(3)	28(6)	5		71(9)

Graduate Program				Total Number
A	B	C		
				0
				0
1				1
1(1)				1(1)
	5			5
	1	1		2
				0
1	7			8
4(1)	3			7(1)
1	1			2
				0
1(1)				1(1)
				0
7	3			10
	1			1
1				1
1	14			15
2	1			3
				0
1				1
2		3		5
	4			4
23(3)	40	4		67(3)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

COLLEGE OF AVIATION

The College of Aviation had 21 undergraduate curriculum changes and two graduate curriculum change for the year (see Table 3) with none of the changes due to assessment. Seven undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, and 14 were substantive course changes. Both graduate program proposals were substantive course changes.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
		5	16	21				2	2

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

Table 4 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
7	14		21		2		2

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

HAWORTH COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

The Haworth College of Business had 21 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and six at the graduate level for a total of 27 proposals. Table 5 shows that seven(33.3%) of the undergraduate proposals were due to formal assessment of student learning and one (4.8%) was due to informal assessment. One (16.7%) of the graduate proposals was the result of formal assessment of student learning. Overall, (33.3%) of the curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 5 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
ACTY			1	7	8					0
BIS				4	4	1			4	5
BUS					0				1	1
FIN	3	1		1	5					0
MGMT		4			4					0
Total	3	5	1	12	21	1	0	0	5	6

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

HAWORTH COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Table 6 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. There were five academic program changes (28.3%) at the undergraduate level with four (80.0%) being due to assessment, eight substantial program changes (38.1%) with four (50%) being due to assessment and eight miscellaneous course changes (38.1%), none based on assessment of student learning. At the graduate level, there were two academic program changes (33.3%), 25 were substantial course changes (66.6%) and no miscellaneous course changes. One (16.7%) of the graduate level changes was due to assessment of student learning.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

	Undergraduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number
ACTY		3	5	8
BIS	1		3	4
BUS				0
FIN		5(4)		5(4)
MGMT	4(4)			4(4)
Total	5(4)	8(4)	8	21(8)

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
			0
1	4(1)		5(1)
1			1
			0
			0
2	4(1)	0	6(1)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The College of Education and Human Development had 16 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 16 at the graduate level, resulting in 32 total curriculum proposals. The data in Table 7 shows that none of the 16 changes at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning, while one (6.3%) of the graduate changes was assessment based. Overall, 3.1% of the curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning.

The College of Education and Human Development also had a significant number of changes that were dictated by accreditation standards at the graduate level (31.3%). If the accreditation dictated changes are added to the assessment based changes, then (37.5%) of the graduate curriculum proposals were based on either assessment data or accreditation requirements.

Table 7 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

	Undergraduate Program						Graduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number		A	B	C	D	Total Number
CECP					0				1		1
CEHD				1	1						0
ELRT				1	1		1			1	2
FCS				13	13					3	3
HPHE				1	1				3	1	4
SPLS					0					3	3
TLES									1	2	3
Total	0	0	0	16	16		1	0	5	10	16

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Table 8 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 56.3% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes while 43.8% were substantive course changes and there were no miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was not responsible for any of the changes. The data for the graduate programs show that 50.0% of the proposals involved academic program changes, 43.8% were substantial course changes and 6.3% were miscellaneous course changes. One of the academic program curriculum changes at the graduate level was based on assessment of student learning.

Table 8 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number		A	B	C	Total Number
CECP				0			1		1
CEHD	1			1					0
ELRT	1			1		2(1)			2(1)
FCS	6	7		13		1	2		3
HPHE	1			1		1	2	1	4
SPLS				0		1	2		3
TLES				0		3			3
Total	9	7	0	16		8(1)	7	1	16(1)

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 of Engineering and Applied Sciences had 24 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 19 at the graduate level, resulting in a grand total of 43 curriculum changes. The data in Table 9 shows that one of the undergraduate changes were based on assessment of student learning (4.2%) while 5.3% of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 4.7% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. Seven of the undergraduate proposals (29.2%) were based upon recommendations from constituents outside the university. None of the graduate changes was due to recommendations from outside constituents.

Table 9 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Undergraduate Program						Graduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
CPE		1	3	1	5					0
CS			1	1	2				8	8
ECE				4	4				4	4
EDMMS			3	1	4					0
IEE/EM					0	1				1
MAE				9	9				6	6
Total	0	1	7	16	24	1	0	0	18	19

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES

Table 10 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 33.3% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 62.5% were substantive course changes, and 4.2% were miscellaneous course changes. One of the undergraduate changes was the result of assessment of student learning (4.2%). The data for the graduate programs show that 94.7% were substantive courses changes, 5.3% were academic program changes and none were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 5.3% of the curriculum changes at the graduate level.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CPE	1	3	1(1)	5(1)				0
CS	2			2		8		8
ECE	3	1		4	1	3		4
EDMMS	2	2		4				0
IEE/EM				0		1(1)		1(1)
MAE		9		9		6		6
Total	8	15	1(1)	24(1)	1	18(1)	0	19 (1)

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 of Fine Arts had 8 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and none at the graduate level. The data in Table 11 show that one of the changes was based on formal assessment (12.5%) and one was in response to informal assessment (12.5%). Overall, (25%) of the curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 11 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Undergraduate Program					
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number
CFA				3	3
MUS		1		1	2
THEA	1			2	3
Total	1	1	0	6	8

A = Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B = Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C = Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D = Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

Table 12 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. All of the proposals were substantive course changes. Assessment was credited for 25.0% of all the changes.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Undergraduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	Total Number
CFA		3		3
MUS		2(1)		2(1)
THEA		3(1)		3(1)
Total	0	8(2)	0	8(2)

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 of Health and Human Services had 22 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 70 at the graduate level, resulting in a grand total of 92 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that none of the undergraduate proposals were based upon assessment data while three of the graduate proposals (4.3%) were based on assessment. Overall, 3.3% of the changes were based on assessment.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

	Undergraduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number
BLS					0
CHHS				1	1
NUR				5	5
PA				1	1
PT					0
SIHP			1	6	7
SPPA				7	7
SWRK				1	1
Total	0	0	1	21	22

Graduate Program				
A	B	C	D	Total Number
		9	2	11
			2	2
		1		1
		5	1	6
			41	41
	1		3	4
		1	1	2
2			1	3
2	1	16	51	70

A= Curriculum changes resulting from formal assessment of student learning.

B= Curriculum changes resulting from informal assessment of student learning such as student feedback and faculty discussions.

C= Curriculum changes that were required or suggested by organizations outside of the university such as accreditation bodies or advisory boards.

D= Curriculum changes that don't fall into any of the categories above.

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Table 14 shows that most of the undergraduate proposals (50.0%) were substantive course changes, with academic program changes making up 18.2% and miscellaneous course changes 31.8% of the proposals. There were no assessment based changes at the undergraduate level.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 78.6% of the changes were at the substantive course level, 10.0% were academic program changes and 11.4% were at the miscellaneous course level. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 5.5% of the substantive course changes.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				A	B	C	Total Number
	A	B	C	Total Number				
BLS				0				
CHHS	1			1				
NUR		2	3	5				
PA		1		1				
PT				0				
SIHP	2	1	4	7				
SPPA	1	6		7				
SWRK		1		1				
Total	4	11	7	22				

Graduate Program				A	B	C	Total Number
A	B	C	Total Number				
2	6	3	11				
2			2				
		1	1				
	5	1	6				
1	38	2	41				
1	3(1)		4(1)				
	1	1	2				
1	2(2)		3(2)				
7	55(3)	8	70(3)				

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

OTHER CURRICULUM CHANGES

There were four proposals submitted from areas outside the seven major colleges in the year covered by this report. One came from the graduate college, two undergraduate proposals came from CELCIS and one proposal established the face-to-face time for Success at WMU. None of the four proposals were due to assessment of student learning.

SUMMARY

It needs to be made clear that the definition of assessment used in this report parallels that of the Higher Learning Commission. Assessment activities are those that measure student learning. Thus, the attempt here is to only include activities that clearly measure what students learn.

Assessment activity was divided into formal assessment (A in the odd number tables) and informal assessment activities (B in the odd numbered tables). This distinction was first made in the 2011 - 2012 report. The distribution between these two categories shows that 41.4% of the 29 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 58.6% due to informal assessment. This is a decrease in formal assessment when compared to last year and shows the lowest percentage of formal assessment when compared to reports from the last three years.

The percentage of curriculum changes attributed to assessment of student learning for all proposals during the time period of this report (2017 – 2018) (7.8%) was lower than that reported in the last five reports which ranged from 10.1% to 17.3%. There is some subjectivity in this data due to the somewhat vague responses to the assessment question on the curriculum form. The range of the percentage of assessment based proposals in the previous six years for undergraduate proposals ranged from a low of 11.2% to a high of 17.1%. This year 10.8% of undergraduate proposals were due to assessment. There is considerable year-to-year variation when looking at only the graduate proposals. The range of assessment based proposals in the past six years ranged from a low of 3.8% to a high of 27.6% with this year being 5.0%. The low percentage of proposals due to assessment is caused by both undergraduate and graduate numbers being at the bottom of the ranges over the years.

The past two years have shown a considerable number of proposals due to Academic Program Review and Planning (APR&P). Combined, 158 proposals submitted in the last two years were due to APR&P. This year, there were 10 proposals attributed to APR&P. This decrease is probably due to the fact that we are now several years out from the review. The next review is scheduled for two years from now, and we will probably see an dramatic increase in APR&P proposals after that time.

The provost asked five years ago that the report include the number of changes due to updating curriculum to match current best practices. There were four proposals this year that clearly fit into this category. Other changes may have fit this criteria, but it was not clear from the response to the assessment question on the curriculum change form.

SUMMARY

The lack of clarity of the assessment question on the curriculum change form (question asking if the change was due to assessment of student learning) continues to be an issue. As in previous years, there were multiple examples in many colleges 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, which is the HLC definition mentioned above.

The first four reports (2007 – 08 through 2010 – 11), and then again in the 2014-15 and 2016 – 17 reports, showed that assessment played a larger role in academic program changes than either substantive or miscellaneous course changes. The 2012-13 report showed that assessment of student learning played the largest role in miscellaneous course changes. In the 2011-12, 2013-14, and 2015-16 reports assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes. The results this year show that assessment played the largest role in academic program changes (8.9% versus 7.7% for substantive course changes and 2.9% for miscellaneous course changes). Thus, seven out of the eleven years of this report, assessment played the largest role in academic program changes.