

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2018 - 19



Office of
Assessment and
Undergraduate Studies

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

August 13, 2019

Prepared by:

Dave Reinhold

Kelley Oliver

Tonya Dean

INTRODUCTION

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019.

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 610 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Three hundred and ninety-seven were at the undergraduate level and 204 at the graduate level. There were also one department name change, one department moving to a different reporting unit, one proposal that moved all courses to a new unit and six accelerated graduate degree program (AGDP) proposals. These nine proposals were not included in either the undergraduate or graduate totals and none were based upon assessment of student learning.

Thirty-eight of the curriculum changes (6.2%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 7.6% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 3.9% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment. This is the same as last 2 years in that more assessment driven changes were made at the undergraduate level.

Overall, assessment data was used most often in making substantive changes. The data show that 6.3% of academic program changes were based on assessment of student learning while 7.6% of the substantive course changes and 1.1% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the undergraduate level, more than half of the proposed changes (52.7%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 16.9% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 25.9%. Less than 1/10 (7.8%) of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 11.9% of the substantive course changes and 2.7% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Like 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 (62.3%) than either academic program changes (27.0%) or miscellaneous course changes (10.8%). Like the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes (4.7%), followed by academic program changes (3.6%). There were no miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level due to assessment of student learning.

CUMALATIVE UNIVERSITY RESULTS

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 610 proposals were used to calculate percent of proposals due to assessment of student learning. Proposals that affected both undergraduate and graduate courses/programs were not omitted from the calculation. None of the nine proposals in the group were based on assessment of student learning.

One final note should be made about this year's report. During this reporting period, over 300 proposals were submitted for the new WMU Essential Studies general education program. Those submissions have not been included in this report.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The College of Arts and Sciences had 117 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 35 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, one case where a department moved its reporting structure and one when courses were moved from one unit to another. These 3 courses were not included in either the undergraduate or graduate numbers. Thus, the total number of proposals was 159.

Table 1 shows that 7.7% of the undergraduate changes and 2.9% of the graduate changes were based upon assessment data. In all, 6.3% 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 42.7% (50) of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 45.3% (53) were substantive course changes, and 12.0% (14) were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment was responsible for 8.0% of the academic program changes, 9.4% of the substantive course changes, and none of the miscellaneous course changes.

The data for the graduate programs show that 42.9% (15) of the proposals involved academic program changes, 45.7% (16) were substantial course changes, and 11.4% were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 6.7% 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

	Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
ANTH				2	2				1	1
BIOS				3	3				2	2
CAS	1			7	8					0
COM	2		4	21	27					0
ECON				9	9					0
ENGL				1	1				2	2
ENVS				5	5					0
GEOG				5	5					0
GEOS				3	3		1		4	5
HIST				3	3				1	1
MATH				3	3				2	2
MDVL					0				1	1
MISE					0				1	1
PHYS				2	2					0
PSCI				2	2					0
PSY				1	1				3	3
SOC	3	1		23	27				2	2
SPAA		1		10	11			4		4
SPAN				3	3				2	2
STAT	1			1	2				9	9
Total	7	2	4	104	117	0	1	4	30	35

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			
	A	B	C	Total Number
ANTH	2			2
BIOS	3			3
CAS	4	4(1)		8(1)
COM	14	8(2)	5	27(2)
ECON	2	7		9
ENGL		1		1
ENVS		5		5
GEOG	5			5
GEOS	2	1		3
HIST	3			3
MATH	2	1		3
MDVL				0
MISE				0
PHYS	2			2
PSCI	2			2
PSY		1		1
SOC	4(2)	16(2)	7	27(4)
SPAA	1	8(1)	2	11(1)
SPAN	3			3
STAT	1	1(1)		2(1)

Total	50(4)	53(5)	14	117(9)
--------------	-------	-------	----	--------

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
1			1
	2		2
			0
			0
			0
1		1	2
			0
			0
4(1)	1		5(1)
	1		1
1	1		2
1			1
1			1
			0
			0
1	2		3
	1	1	2
	4		4
1	1		2
4	3	2	9

15(1)	16	4	35(1)
-------	----	---	-------

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 51 undergraduate curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with none of the changes due to assessment. One undergraduate proposal was an academic program change (2.0%), 42 were substantive course changes (82.4%) and 8 were miscellaneous course changes (15.7%).

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Undergraduate Program				
A	B	C	D	Total Number
		1	50	51

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			
A	B	C	Total Number
1	42	8	51

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 45 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and nine at the graduate level for a total of 54 proposals. Table 5 shows that there were no proposals related to assessment of student learning at either the graduate or undergraduate level. One undergraduate proposal was attributed to recommendation from an outside body and five undergraduate proposals were due to keeping up with professional standards.

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	1				2	2
BIS				15	15				5	5
FCL				2	2					0
MGMT			5	7	12				2	2
MKTG			1	14	15					0
Total	0	0	6	39	45	0	0	0	9	9

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 seven academic program changes (15.6%), 32 substantial program changes (71.1%) and six miscellaneous course changes (13.3%) of the undergraduate levels none of which were based on assessment of student learning. At the graduate level, there were four academic program changes (44.4%), four substantial course changes (44.4%) and one miscellaneous course change (11.1%). As was the case at the undergraduate level, none of the curriculum changes at the graduate level were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 6 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

	Undergraduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number
ACTY		1		1
BIS	2	13		15
FCL	1	1		2
MGMT		10	2	12
MKTG	4	7	4	15
Total	7	32	6	45

Graduate Program			
A	B	C	Total Number
1		1	2
2	3		5
			0
1	1		2
			0
4	4	1	9

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 39 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 54 at the graduate level and one for an AGDP, not evaluated on either undergraduate or graduate, resulting in 94 total curriculum proposals. The data in Table 7 shows that 2 of the 39 changes at the undergraduate level were due to assessment of student learning (5.1%), while 4 (7.4%) of the graduate changes was assessment based. Overall, 6.4% of the curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning. At the graduate level, 12 (22.2%) proposals were the result of accreditation or a request from some other external body.

Table 7 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Department	Undergraduate Program						Graduate Program				
	A	B	C	D	Total Number		A	B	C	D	Total Number
CEHD				1	1						0
ELRT				1	1		4		7	8	19
FCS	2			11	13				2	6	8
HPHE				12	12					8	8
SPLS				3	3				3	2	5
TLES				9	9					14	14
Total	2	0	0	37	39		4	0	12	38	54

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 17.9% of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 61.5% were substantive course changes and (20.5%) were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning played a role in two (28.6%) of the academic program changes. None of the undergraduate substantive course changes or miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment of student learning.

The data for the graduate programs show that 15 (27.8%) of the proposals involved academic program changes, 33 (61.1%) were substantial course changes and 6 (11.1%) were miscellaneous course changes. One (6.7%) of the academic program curriculum changes at the graduate level was based on assessment of student learning, three (9.1%) of the substantive course changes involved assessment of student learning, while none of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment activities.

Table 8 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Graduate Program			
	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
CEHD	1			1				0
ELRT	1			1	1(1)	17(3)	1	19(4)
FCS	4(2)	9		13(2)	2	6		8
HPHE	1	9	2	12	2	2	4	8
SPLS		2	1	3		4	1	5
TLES		4	5	9	10	4		14
Total	7(2)	24	8	39(2)	15(1)	33(3)	6	54(4)

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 63 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 21 at the graduate level. There was also one proposal for an AGDP that was not included in either the undergraduate or graduate numbers. Therefore, a grand total of 85 curriculum changes were submitted by the college. The data in Table 9 shows that one of the undergraduate changes was based on assessment of student learning (1.6%) while one (4.8%) of the graduate curriculum changes was assessment based. Thus, 2.4% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. Seven of the undergraduate proposals (3.2%) were based upon recommendations from constituents outside the university, and one (4.8%) of the graduate changes was due to recommendations from outside constituents.

Table 9 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

	Undergraduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number
CEAS				7	7
CCE				1	1
CPE	1		1	14	16
CS			1	16	17
ECE				2	2
EDMMS			2	4	6
IEE/IEM				4	4
MAE				10	10
Total	1	0	4	58	63

Graduate Program				
A	B	C	D	Total Number
				0
			1	1
			3	3
			7	7
	1	1	6	8
				0
				0
			2	2
0	1	1	19	21

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 15 (23.8%) of the undergraduate proposals were academic program changes, 34 (54.0%) were substantive course changes, and 14 (22.2%) were miscellaneous course changes. In addition, 2.9% of substantive course changes was the result of assessment of student learning. The data for the graduate programs show that 8 (38.1%) were academic program changes, 12 (57.1%) were substantive courses changes, and one (4.8%) was a miscellaneous course change. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 8.3% of the substantive 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
CEAS	2	5		7				0
CCE		1		1			1	1
CPE	6	2(1)	8	16(1)	1	2		3
CS	3	14		17	2	5		7
ECE	1	1		2	5	3(1)		8(1)
EDMMS	1	1	4	6				0
IEE/IEM	1	3		4				0
MAE	1	7	2	10		2		2
Total	15	34(1)	14	63(1)	8	12(1)	1	21(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 20 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and two at the graduate level. The data in Table 11 show that five of the undergraduate changes were based on formal assessment (25.0%) and one was in response to informal assessment (5.0%). None of the graduate curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning.

Table 11 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

Undergraduate Program						Graduate Program				
Department	A	B	C	D	Total Number	A	B	C	D	Total Number
DANC				2	2					0
MUS				8	8				2	2
THEA	5	1		4	10					0
Total	5	1	0	14	20	0	0	0	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.

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS

Table 12 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. At the undergraduate level 40% (8) of the changes were academic program changes, 30% (6) were substantive course changes and 30% (6) were miscellaneous course changes. The data also shows that 12.5% (1) of the academic program changes were due to assessment of student learning while 66.7% (4) of the substantive course changes and 16.7% (1) of the miscellaneous course changes were the results of assessment. At the graduate level, one academic program change and one miscellaneous course change were made with neither due to assessment of student learning.

Table 12 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Undergraduate Program					Graduate Program			
Department	A	B	C	Total Number	A	B	C	Total Number
DANC	1		1	2				0
MUS	5	1	2	8	1		1	2
THEA	2(1)	5(4)	3(1)	10(6)				0
Total	8(1)	6(4)	6(1)	20(6)	1	0	1	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 61 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level, 83 at the graduate level, resulting in a grand total of 144 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that 12 (19.7%) of the undergraduate proposals were based upon assessment data while two (2.4%) of the graduate proposals were based on assessment. Overall, 9.7% 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				3	3
PA				2	2
OT			1	2	3
SIHP	2	9	2	35	48
SPPA	1			3	4
SWRK					0
Total	3	9	3	46	61

Graduate Program				
A	B	C	D	Total Number
		2	3	5
			1	1
			8	8
				0
		32		32
	1	15	10	26
			2	2
1			8	9
1	1	49	32	83

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 (59.0%) were substantive course changes, with academic program changes making up 23.0% (14) and miscellaneous course changes 18.0% (11) of the proposals. Assessment of student learning was responsible for one (7.4%) of the academic program changes and 11 (18.0%) of the substantive course changes.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 74.7% (62) of the changes were at the substantive course level, 14.5% (12) were academic program changes and 10.8% (9) were at the miscellaneous course level. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 3.2% (2) of the substantive course changes.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

Department	Undergraduate Program				Total Number	Graduate Program				Total Number
	A	B	C			A	B	C		
BLS					0	2	3			5
CHHS		1			1		1			1
NUR	2	1			3		5	3		8
PA		2			2					0
OT		1	2		3	1	31			32
SIHP	11	30(11)	7		48(11)	8	16(1)	2		26(1)
SPPA	1(1)	1	2		4(1)	1		1		2
SWRK					0		6(1)	3		9(1)
Total	14(1)	36(11)	11		61(12)	12	62(2)	9		83(2)

A = Academic program changes

B = Substantive course changes

C = Miscellaneous course changes

() = Number of changes due to assessment results

OTHER CURRICULUM CHANGES

There was one proposal submitted from areas outside the seven major colleges in the year covered by this report. It was from Extended University Programs and was a program deletion that was not based on 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 continuous improvement activities that clearly measure what students learn as assessment-based changes.

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 60.5% of the 38 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 39.5% due to informal assessment. This is a increase in formal assessment when compared to last year.

The percentage of curriculum changes attributed to assessment of student learning for all proposals during the time period of this report (2017 – 2018) (6.2%) was lower than that reported in the last six reports which ranged from 7.8% 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 seven years for undergraduate proposals ranged from a low of 10.8% to a high of 17.1%. This year 7.6% 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 previous seven years ranged from a low of 3.8% to a high of 27.6% with this year being 3.9%. 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 low percentage of proposals attributed to assessment of student learning this year may in part be due to the number of departments that created or revisited programs based on their strategic plans and not assessment of student learning. For example, engineering proposed a new major in biomedical engineering and collaborated with businesses to propose a BS in cybersecurity. Occupational therapy sent in dozens of proposals to change their program from a master's degree to a doctoral degree as required by their accreditation body. Communication, criminal justice, and interdisciplinary health science made changes in programs in order to encourage more students to apply to those programs. In all, these changes involved approximately 200 of the total number of proposals. If these are taken out of the equation, the percent of proposals based on assessment of student learning increases to closer to 10% which is typical for past reports.

SUMMARY

The past three years have shown a considerable number of proposals due to Academic Program Review and Planning (APR&P). Combined, 168 proposals submitted in the last three years were due to APR&P. This year, there were 10 proposals attributed to APR&P, the same as last year. Obviously the momentum for APR&P related proposals has greatly reduced in the last two years. The next review is scheduled for this coming year, 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 18 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. These 18 proposals do not include proposals based on accreditation.

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, 2016–17, and 2017-18 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 substantive course changes (11.9% versus 9.7% for academic program changes and 1.5% for miscellaneous course changes). Thus, seven out of the twelve years of this report, assessment played the largest role in academic program changes.