

ASSESSMENT AND CURRICULUM CHANGE

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2019 - 20

February 17, 2021

Prepared by:

Dave Reinhold

Kelley Oliver

Tonya Dean

INTRODUCTION

This report contains all curriculum changes processed by the Curriculum Manager from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

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 442 curriculum changes processed during the twelve months covered by this report. Of these proposals, 268 were at the undergraduate level and 162 at the graduate level. There were also seven proposals creating accelerated graduate degree programs (AGDP) and five proposals that involved prefix changes at both the graduate and undergraduate level. These 12 proposals were not included in either the undergraduate or graduate totals and none were based upon assessment of student learning.

Twenty-eight of the curriculum changes (6.3%) were the result of assessment of student learning (either formal or informal). Further analysis shows that 6.3% of the undergraduate curriculum changes were the result of assessment of student learning and 6.8% of the graduate changes were attributed to assessment. This is the opposite of the last 3 years in that a higher percentage of the assessment driven changes were made at the graduate level.

Overall, assessment data was used most often in making substantive course changes. The data show that 7.8% of the substantive course changes were based on assessment of student learning while 5.3% of academic program changes and 5.0% of the miscellaneous course changes were assessment based.

At the **undergraduate level**, a little less than half of the proposed changes (47.8%) were substantive course changes. Miscellaneous course changes accounted for 14.9% of the proposals while academic program changes represented 37.3%. The data shows that 5.0% of the academic program changes were the result of assessment of student learning while 8.6% of the substantive course changes and 2.5% of the miscellaneous course changes were due to assessment results. Similar to the last two years, 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 (55.6%) than either academic program changes (19.8%) or miscellaneous course changes (24.7%). Unlike the undergraduate changes, assessment played the largest role in miscellaneous course changes (7.5%), followed by substantive course changes (6.7%) and academic program changes (6.3%).

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

CUMALATIVE UNIVERSITY RESULTS

substantive course change category. Finally, all 442 non-WES 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. As noted earlier, none of the 12 proposals in the group was based on assessment of student learning.

One final note should be made about this year's report. Similar to last year, we processed many proposals submitted for the new WMU Essential Studies general education program during this reporting period. Those submissions have not been included in this report to be consistent with what was done last year. Although these proposals (350) might be indirectly the result of assessment of student learning, including these would complicate any comparison with previous years in which only a relatively few general education proposals were submitted.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

The College of Arts and Sciences had 71 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 80 at the graduate level. Three additional curriculum changes involved accelerated graduate degree programs and were not included in either the undergraduate or the graduate numbers. Thus, the total number of proposals was 154.

Table 1 shows that five of the undergraduate changes (7.0% of all undergraduate (UG) proposals from the college) and three of the graduate changes (3.8% of all graduate (G) proposals from the college) were based upon assessment data. In all, 5.2% of the curriculum changes in the college were the result of assessment. Also, four undergraduate proposals (5.6% of all UG proposals from the college) were due to suggestions from external constituents not related to accreditation and 46 graduate proposals (57.5% of all G proposals from the college) were the result of accreditation requirements.

Table 2 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. The data show that 46 of the undergraduate proposals (64.8% of all UG proposals from the college) were academic program changes, 24 (33.8% of all UG proposals from the college) were substantive course changes, and one (1.4% of all UG proposals from the college) was a miscellaneous course change. Assessment was responsible for 4.3% of the academic program changes, 12.5% of the substantive course changes, and was not a factor in the miscellaneous course change.

The data for the graduate programs show that nine of the proposals (11.3% of all G proposals) involved academic program changes, 47 (58.8% of all G proposals from the college) were substantial course changes, and 24 (30.0% of all G proposals from the college) were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment results were used in 22.2% of the academic program changes and 2.1% of the substantive course changes and none of the 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 |
| BIOS | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| CAS | | | | 7 | 7 | | | | | 0 |
| CHEM | 1 | | | 8 | 9 | | | | | 0 |
| COM | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| ECON | | | | | 0 | | | | 5 | 5 |
| ENGL | | | 2 | 11 | 13 | | | | 4 | 4 |
| ENVS | | | 1 | 3 | 4 | | | | | 0 |
| GEOG | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| GEOS | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| GIST | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| GWS | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| HIST | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| IIAS | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| MATH | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 5 | | | | 5 | 5 |
| MDVL | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 0 |
| PSCI | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 4 | 4 |
| PSY | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 0 |
| REL | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | 4 | 4 |
| SPAA | | | | | 0 | 2 | | 46 | | 48 |
| SPAN | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| STAT | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| WLL | | | | 12 | 12 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 4 | 1 | 4 | 62 | 71 | 2 | 1 | 46 | 31 | 80 |

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

| | Undergraduate Program | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|------|---|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | Total Number |
| BIOS | | 1 | | 1 |
| CAS | 7 | | | 7 |
| CHEM | 3 | 6(1) | | 9(1) |
| COM | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| ECON | | | | 0 |
| ENGL | 6 | 7 | | 13 |
| ENVS | 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| GEOG | | 1(1) | | 1(1) |
| GEOS | 2 | | | 2 |
| GIST | 2 | | | 2 |
| GWS | 2 | | | 2 |
| HIST | 1 | | | 1 |
| IIAS | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| MATH | | 5(1) | | 5(1) |
| MDVL | | 1 | | 1 |
| PSCI | 1 | | | 1 |
| PSY | 1 | | | 1 |
| REL | 2(2) | | | 2(2) |
| SPAA | | | | |
| SPAN | 2 | | | 2 |
| STAT | 1 | | | 1 |
| WLL | 12 | | | 12 |

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------|-------|---|-------|
| Total | 46(2) | 24(3) | 1 | 71(5) |
|--------------|-------|-------|---|-------|

| Graduate Program | | | |
|------------------|------|----|--------------|
| A | B | C | Total Number |
| | 2 | | 2 |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| | 1 | | 1 |
| 1 | | 4 | 5 |
| | 4 | | 4 |
| | | | 0 |
| 1 | 1(1) | | 2(1) |
| | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| | | | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| | | | 0 |
| 1 | 3 | | 4 |
| 2(2) | 28 | 18 | 48(2) |
| | | | 0 |
| | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | 1 | | 1 |

| | | | |
|------|-------|----|-------|
| 9(2) | 47(1) | 24 | 80(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 48 undergraduate and two graduate curriculum changes for the year (see Table 3) with none of the changes due to assessment of student learning. One undergraduate proposal (2.1% of all UG proposals from the college) was the result of external advisors not related to accreditation and two (4.2% of all UG proposals from the college) were the result of accreditation. Both graduate proposals (100% of all G proposals from the college) were the result of external constituents not related to accreditation.

Table 3 – Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| Undergraduate Program | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|----|--------------|
| A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| | | 3 | 45 | 48 |

| Graduate Program | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|---|--------------|
| A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| | | 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.

Six undergraduate proposals (12.5% of all UG proposals from the college) were academic program changes, 11 (22.9% of all UG proposals from the college) were substantive course changes and 31 (64.6% of all UG proposals) were miscellaneous course changes. Both of the graduate proposals (100% of all G proposals from the college) were substantive course changes.

Table 4 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| Undergraduate Program | | | |
|-----------------------|----|----|--------------|
| A | B | C | Total Number |
| 6 | 11 | 31 | 48 |

| Graduate Program | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------------|
| A | B | C | Total Number |
| | 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 20 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and nine at the graduate level for a total of 29 proposals. Table 5 shows that there were four proposals (20% of all UG proposals from the college) related to assessment of student learning at the undergraduate level and none at the graduate level. The result of this is that assessment of student learning was involved in 13.8% of all proposals submit by the college. One undergraduate proposal (5.0% of all UG proposals from the college) was attributed to recommendations from an external constituent not related to accreditation and two graduate proposals (22.2% of all G proposals from the college) were due to accreditation.

Table 5 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| Undergraduate Program | | | | | | Graduate Program | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|----|--------------|------------------|---|---|---|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | D | Total Number | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| ACTY | | | | 4 | 4 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| BIS | | | | 3 | 3 | | | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| BUS | | | | | 0 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| MGMT | 4 | | 1 | 6 | 11 | | | | | 0 |
| MKTG | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 4 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 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 nine academic program changes (45.0% of all UG proposals from the college), nine substantive course changes (45.0% of all UG proposals from the college) and two miscellaneous course changes (10.0% of all UG proposals from the college) at the undergraduate level. Twenty-two percent of both the academic program changes and the substantive course changes were based on assessment of student learning.

At the graduate level, there were three academic program changes (33.3% of all G proposals from the college), four substantial course changes (44.4% of all G proposals from the college) and two miscellaneous course changes (22.2% of all G proposals from the college). 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 | 3 | | 1 | 4 |
| BIS | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| BUS | | | | 0 |
| MGMT | 4(2) | 7(2) | | 11(4) |
| MKTG | | 2 | | 2 |
| Total | 9(2) | 9(2) | 2 | 20(4) |

| Graduate Program | | | |
|------------------|---|---|--------------|
| A | B | C | Total Number |
| | | 2 | 2 |
| 2 | 4 | | 6 |
| 1 | | | 1 |
| | | | 0 |
| | | | 0 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 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 44 curriculum proposals at the undergraduate level and 20 at the graduate, resulting in a total of 64 proposals. The data in Table 7 shows that four of the 44 changes at the undergraduate level (9.1% of all UG proposals from the college) were due to assessment of student learning, while one of the graduate changes (5.0% of all G proposals from the college) was assessment based. Overall, 7.8% of the curriculum changes submitted by the college were due to assessment of student learning. At the undergraduate level, 2 proposals (4.5% of all UG proposals from the college) resulted from accreditation requirements and four proposals (9.1% of all UG proposals from the college) an external body not related to accreditation.

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 |
| CECP | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 4 |
| ELRT | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | 9 | 9 |
| FCS | 3 | | 6 | 16 | 25 | | | | 2 | 2 |
| HPHE | | | | 10 | 10 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| SPLS | 1 | | | 4 | 5 | | | | 1 | 1 |
| TLES | | | | | 0 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 4 | 0 | 6 | 34 | 44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 20 |

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 five (11.4% of all UG proposals from the college) were academic program changes, 38 (86.4% of all UG proposals from the college) were substantive course changes and one (2.3% of all UG proposals from the college) was a miscellaneous course change. Assessment of student learning played a role in four (10.5%) of the substantive course changes. None of the undergraduate academic program changes or miscellaneous course changes was due to assessment of student learning.

The data for the graduate programs show that six (30.0% of all G proposals from the college) involved academic program changes, 10 (50.0% of all G proposals from the college) were substantial course changes and four (20.0% of all G proposals from the college) were miscellaneous course changes. One (10.0%) of the substantive course changes at the graduate level was based on assessment of student learning, while none of the academic program changes nor the miscellaneous course changes involved 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 | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | 1(1) | 1 | 4(1) |
| ELRT | | 3 | | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 |
| FCS | 3 | 21(3) | 1 | 25(3) | | 2 | | 2 |
| HPHE | 1 | 9 | | 10 | | 1 | | 1 |
| SPLS | | 5(1) | | 5(1) | | 1 | | 1 |
| TLES | | | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 5 | 38(4) | 1 | 44(4) | 6 | 10(1) | 4 | 20(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 34 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 11 at the graduate level for a grand total of 45 curriculum proposals. The data in Table 9 shows that one of the undergraduate changes (2.9% of all UG proposals from the college) was based on assessment of student learning while none of the graduate curriculum changes were assessment based. Thus, 2.2% of all the proposals from the college were based upon assessment of student learning. Two of the undergraduate proposals (5.9% of all UG proposals from the college) were based upon recommendations from external constituents not related to accreditation and five (14.7% of all UG proposals from the college) were due to accreditation. Two of the graduate changes (18.2% of all G proposals from the college) were due to accreditation.

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 |
| CCE | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| CPE | | | 1 | 5 | 6 | | | | 3 | 3 |
| CS | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | | | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| ECE | | | | 4 | 4 | | | | 4 | 4 |
| EDMMS | | | | 3 | 3 | | | | | 0 |
| IEE/IEM | | | | 2 | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| MAE | | | 2 | 9 | 11 | | | | | |
| Total | 0 | 1 | 7 | 26 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 11 |

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 19 (55.9% of all UG proposals from the college) were academic program changes, 13 (38.2% of all UG proposals from the college) were substantive course changes, and two (5.9% of all UG proposals) were miscellaneous course changes. In addition, 7.7% of substantive course changes were the result of assessment of student learning.

The data for the graduate programs show that eight (72.7% of all G proposals from the college) were academic program changes, two (18.2% of all the G proposals from the college) were substantive courses changes, and one (9.1% of all G proposals from the college) was a miscellaneous course change. None of the proposals at the graduate level resulted from the assessment of student learning.

Table 10 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| Undergraduate Program | | | | | Graduate Program | | | |
|-----------------------|----|-------|---|--------------|------------------|---|---|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | Total Number | A | B | C | Total Number |
| CCE | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| CPE | 4 | | 2 | 6 | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| CS | 1 | 5(1) | | 6(1) | 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| ECE | 2 | 2 | | 4 | 4 | | | 4 |
| EDMMS | 3 | | | 3 | | | | 0 |
| IEE/IEM | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 0 |
| MAE | 6 | 5 | | 11 | | | | 0 |
| Total | 19 | 13(1) | 2 | 34(1) | 8 | 2 | 1 | 11 |

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 30 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and five at the graduate level for a total of 35. The data in Table 11 show that two of the undergraduate changes (6.7% of all UG proposals from the college) were based on assessment of student learning. None of the graduate curriculum changes were due to assessment of student learning. As a result, assessment of student learning was responsible for 5.7% of the proposals submitted by the college. In addition, one undergraduate proposal (3.3% of all UG proposals from the college) and one graduate proposal (20.0% of all G proposals from the college) were due to accreditation.

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 |
| ART | | | | 20 | 20 | | | | | 0 |
| DANC | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | | | | | 0 |
| MUS | | | | 5 | 5 | | | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| THEA | | 1 | | 2 | 3 | | | | | 0 |
| Total | 1 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 |

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 seven (23.3% of all UG proposals from the college) were academic program changes, 22 (73.3% of all UG proposals from the college) were substantive course changes and one (3.3% of all UG proposals from the college) was a miscellaneous course change. The data also shows that one 3.3% of the undergraduate academic program changes were due to assessment of student learning and one 3.3% of the undergraduate miscellaneous course changes was the result of assessment. At the graduate level, all five proposals were substantive course changes and none were 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 |
| ART | | 20 | | 20 | | | | 0 |
| DANC | | 1 | 1(1) | 2(1) | | | | 0 |
| MUS | 4 | 1 | | 5 | | 5 | | 5 |
| THEA | 3(1) | | | 3(1) | | | | 0 |
| Total | 7(1) | 22 | 1(1) | 30(2) | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |

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 20 curriculum changes at the undergraduate level and 35 at the graduate level. The college also submitted four proposals for accelerated graduate degree programs and five proposals for prefix changes that are not included in either the undergraduate or graduate numbers. This results in a grand total of 64 curriculum changes. Table 13 shows that one (5.0% of all UG proposals from the college) of the undergraduate proposals was based upon assessment data while seven (20.0% of all G proposals from the college) of the graduate proposals were based on assessment. Overall, 12.5% of the changes were based on assessment. In addition, two (5.7% of all G proposals from the college) were related to accreditation.

Table 13 - Evaluation of Curriculum Changes Resulting from Assessment

| | Undergraduate Program | | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|---|---|----|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| BLS | | | | | 0 |
| NUR | | 1 | | 2 | 3 |
| OT | | | | 1 | 1 |
| PA | | | | | 0 |
| PT | | | | | 0 |
| SIHP | | | | 10 | 10 |
| SPPA | | | | 5 | 5 |
| SWRK | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 20 |

| Graduate Program | | | | |
|------------------|---|---|----|--------------|
| A | B | C | D | Total Number |
| 1 | | | 3 | 4 |
| | | | | 0 |
| | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 1 | 1 |
| | 2 | | | 2 |
| | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 |
| | | | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 | | 12 | 15 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 26 | 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 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Table 14 shows the data broken down by the type of curriculum change. Ten of the undergraduate proposals (50.0% of all UG proposals from the college) were substantive course changes, with eight (40.0% of all UG proposals from the college) academic program changes and two (10.0% of all UG proposals from the college) miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 10.0% of the substantive course changes.

Results for the graduate curriculum changes showed that 20 (57.1% of all G proposals from the college) of the changes were at the substantive course level, six (17.1% of all G proposals from the college) were academic program changes and nine (25.7% of all G proposals from the college) were miscellaneous course changes. Assessment of student learning was responsible for 20.0% of the substantive course changes and 33.3% of the miscellaneous course changes at the graduate level.

Table 14 - Categories of Curriculum Changes

| Undergraduate Program | | | | | Graduate Program | | | |
|-----------------------|----------|--------------|----------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Department | A | B | C | Total Number | A | B | C | Total Number |
| BLS | | | | 0 | | 4(1) | | 4(1) |
| NUR | 1 | 2(1) | | 3(1) | | | | 0 |
| OT | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 |
| PA | | | | 0 | 1 | | | 1 |
| PT | | | | 0 | | | 2(2) | 2(2) |
| SIHP | 3 | 6 | 1 | 10 | | 4(1) | 5 | 9(1) |
| SPPA | 3 | 2 | | 5 | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| SWRK | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | 12(2) | 1(1) | 15(3) |
| Total | 8 | 10(1) | 2 | 20(1) | 6 | 20(4) | 9(3) | 35(7) |

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 the Center for English Language and Culture for International Students and was an undergraduate substantive course change 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 67.9% of the 28 assessment driven changes were due to formal assessment and 32.1% 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 (2019 – 2020) (6.3%) was at the lower end of that reported in the last six reports which ranged from 6.2% 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 7.6% to a high of 17.1%. This year 6.3% 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 6.8%.

The low percentage of proposals attributed to assessment of student learning this year may in part be due to two large curriculum changes that were in response to external factors, not assessment of student learning. The College of Education and Human Development proposed a new structure for the secondary education program that was a response to decreasing enrollment. These changes began in the 2018 – 2019 academic year and continued with 29 additional proposals this year. The School of Public Affairs and Administration made 46 changes in their graduate program that were related to accreditation. Changes like those described above (response to enrollment, external consultants or accreditation) comprise 106 of the total number of proposals submitted this year (442). If these 106 proposals are taken out of the calculation, the percent of proposals based on assessment of student learning increases to 8.3% (28 out of 336).

SUMMARY

The past four years have resulted in 178 proposals submitted as a result of the 2014 -2015 Academic Program Review and Planning (APR&P) process. This year, there were 23 proposals attributed to APR&P. The momentum for APR&P related proposals has reduced in the last three years, but overall, 201 curriculum changes have been the result of APR&P. The next review is scheduled for this year, and we will probably see a dramatic increase in APR&P related proposals after that.

The provost asked six years ago that the report include the number of changes due to updating curriculum to match current best practices. There were no proposals this year that clearly fit into this category. Other changes may have fit this criterion, but it was not clear from the response to the assessment question on the curriculum change form.

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 previously.

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, 2015-16 and 2018 – 2019 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 (7.8% versus 5.3% for academic program changes and 5.0% for miscellaneous course changes). Thus, in seven out of the thirteen years of this report, assessment played the largest role in academic program changes. Assessment played the largest role in substantive course changes in five of the years and only once was assessment the largest contributor to miscellaneous course changes.