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The Urban Studies program began collecting data during the 2011-2012 AY.

Data was collected using a survey that included both Likert scale questions and open-ended essays. Both the Likert scale questions and the open-ended essays directly address the 5 program SLO’s. The Likert scale questions ask students to indicate how well they believe that they have achieved each program SLO. Open-ended essays were crafted in order to allow faculty to assess student achievement in each SLO.

The response rates have been low. During most of the 2011-12 AY, data was collected via an online Canvas survey associated with the Capstone course. The response rate for the online surveys was extremely low, as a consequence the issues was revisited by the faculty and during most of the 2012-13 AY data was collected via hard copies distributed in Capstone. While the response rate improved, it was still low. The data that was collected suggest that students are satisfied with program and believe they are achieving the program learning objectives. Open-ended questions were problematic in that many students did not complete this part of the survey, several indicating that they did not have time to provide the necessary answers.

At the end of the 2012-13 AY, the faculty expressed dissatisfaction with the process. While it was clear that students are satisfied with program and believe they are achieving the program learning objectives, the response rates have consistently been low. Faculty were especially concerned with the issues associated with the open-ended questions. As noted above, open-ended questions were problematic in that many students did not complete this part of the survey, several indicating that they did not have time to provide the necessary answers. Faculty discussion of the data obtained from students determined that additional measures for “faculty graded” assessment are needed in the future.

The program had intended to revisit assessment as part of the strategic planning process that was begun during the 2013-14 AY. However, as the strategic planning process unfolded, faculty discussions around issues of assessment, recruitment, and retention focused on curriculum revision. Most of the 2013-14 AY has been focused on developing a strategic plan, with a specific focus on curriculum revision that address issues of assessment, recruitment, and retention.

In discussing student achievement of program SLO’s, it was decided that this is best addressed by a curriculum that includes a “common core” of 3 classes that will be a requirement for all of the degrees offered in the Urban Studies Program. Additional curriculum revision will include “concentrations” within each degree. Each of these “concentrations” will relate directly to one or more SLO’s. As the themes of “common core” and focus of the “concentrations” are decided, there may be some revision made to program SLO’s.

Themes for the “common core”, the focus of the “concentrations”, and possible revisions to SLO’s will be finalized by the time of the 2014-15 AY retreat. After that time, the assessment tool/process will also be revised in order to reflect changes in the curriculum. Additionally, revision of the assessment tool/process will also focus on improving response rate and incorporating additional measures for “faculty graded” assessment. The new will tool/process will allow us to more directly measure each individual SLO.
1. **Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.**

Metrics and benchmarks are used to assure consistency and continuous quality improvement of advising services. Data is collected, analyzed and used in reports to campus stakeholders to improve overall Unit performance.

2. **Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.**

- Coordinated communication to students to align with messaging sent by the Offices of Admissions, Registration, Student Transition Programs, and Undergraduate Education. This includes communication with:
  - New students upon payment of the Enrollment Confirmation Fee
  - New students upon completion of their Transfer Credit Evaluation by Admissions
- The following metric and benchmarks were established for evaluating achievement of stated goals and learning outcomes:
  - Metric – Student use of MyPlan
    - Benchmark – Seventy percent (70%) of students receiving AAC Enrollment Confirmation Fee communication use MyPlan
    - Benchmark – Seventy percent (70%) of students receiving AAC Transfer Credit Evaluation communication use MyPlan

3. **Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcome(s) did you address this year?**

The Unit focus in 2013-14 was to solidify student use of MyPlan in order to empower them to achieve their academic goals, to improve accessibility, and to establish benchmarks for continuous improvement.

4. **Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research, or Service (UW accreditation themes, NWCCU Standard I.B.1, 1.B.2, 4.A.1)**

These address primarily the teaching and service themes of the UW.

The Unit mission is to:

“Serve the campus community as educators, partners and consultants, empowering students to

- Explore academic and career options
- Build relevant skills and experience, and
- Succeed academically, personally and professionally.”
5. **What type of data did you collect to assess this goal (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making?**

- UW Tacoma Winter Assessment of the Student Experience 2011 – 2014
- Unit weekly survey of students who participate in advising appointments
- Google Analytics for MyPlan usage

6. **Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty, and suggestions made for program improvement as a result 4.A.3, 4.B.1**

Meetings with UWS Information Management/Student Information Systems were held in Winter and Spring 2014. Discussions are ongoing.

7. **Document how you made the results available to appropriate constituencies. (4.B.1, 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students).**

Outcomes and program improvements are reported

- Monthly to Academic Advising Center staff through regular meetings
- Monthly to Enrollment Services staff through regular meetings
- Quarterly to the Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Annually to academic program directors/deans
1. **Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.**

Criminal justice faculty members met this year and developed program level student learning goals. These thirteen goals were then mapped to individual required courses.

2. **Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.**

We will begin data collection for assessment purposes at the beginning of the 2014-2015 academic year.

3. **Document how you now have an annual cycle to:**

   a) Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcome(s) did you address this year?

   We will begin assessing Student Learning Outcomes in the 2014-2015 academic year.

   b) Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research, or Service (UW accreditation themes, NWCCU Standard I.B.1, I.B.2., 4.A.1)

   This is an outcome for Teaching.

   c) What type of data did you collect to assess this goal (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making.

   While data collection will not begin until the next academic year, we have established the type of data we will utilize to provide evidence for decision making. We are planning a three part assessment of CJ Student Learning Outcomes that will be identical for our on-campus and online programs:

   1) Each of the 13 outcomes is tied to a specific assignment in one of the required CJ courses. An assignment will be given in each course that measures the specific SLO.

   2) To assess SLO at the program level, an assignment will be given in our introductory Diversity and Social Justice in Criminal Justice (T CRIM 225) course and will be given again in our Senior Seminar (T CRIM 441) course. This will be reviewed for overall student growth in achieving many of the program’s learning outcomes.

   3) A student self-assessment survey addressing all program outcomes will be created for the students to take in the Senior Seminar course.

   d) Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)?

   N/A
e) Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty, and suggestions made for program improvement as a result. 4.A.3, 4.B.1

N/A

f) Document how you made the results available to appropriate constituencies. (4.B. 1, 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students).

N/A

Note: We will not complete the large spreadsheet on goals this year, because we are almost all in compliance on all phases.
1. Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.

We have no new policies around measurement of SLOs.

2. Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.

We collect data related to the Professional Education Standards Board requirements to demonstrate that our certification programs meet WACs. In 2014 the WACs changed resulting the revision of several courses to meet the new WACs.

3. Document how you now have an annual cycle to:

   g) Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcome(s) did you address this year?

      SLO 4 : Demonstrate strategic decision making for the betterment of the students, classrooms, families, schools and communities

   h) Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research, or Service?

      Teaching

   i) What type of data did you collect to assess this goal (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making.

      Faculty members identified the assessment evidence collected from their courses. This evidence was

   j) Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)?

      No

   k) Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty, and suggestions made for program improvement as a result. 4.A.3, 4.B.1

      Data were analyzed and discussed by faculty at the June 3, 2014 faculty meeting.

   l) Document how you made the results available to appropriate constituencies. (4.B. 1, 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students).

      Results will be maintained for PESB, advisory boards, and other constituencies’ review and use.

      Note: We will not complete the large spreadsheet on goals this year, because we are almost all in compliance on all phases.
**Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.**

Since the last report in spring 2013, IAS has almost completely converted to major-specific portfolios as the primary tool for measuring achievement of SLOs. A handful of students who were “grandfathered” in under the previous system submitted an older version of the portfolio designed to measure the general SLOs established for the entire IAS program. This year, each major used their own portfolios to generate major-specific reports, which were then collected by IAS leadership. This spring the IAS faculty voted to eliminate the portfolio as a graduation requirement for all students, and faculty have been asked to determine whether they want to continue collecting portfolios for assessment purposes or design new assessment tools to measure SLOs. This will happen in the coming year.

**Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.**

Because this was the first year that faculty had access to portfolios tailored to the SLOs of individual majors (rather than the SLOs of IAS), there has not yet been an opportunity to make changes in response to the data. Faculty from all majors have, however, offered recommendations for changes to be made in the coming year.

**Document how you now have an annual cycle to:**

a) Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcome(s) did you address this year?

Rather than focusing on one SLO, most majors addressed all of their outcomes this year, largely in an attempt to identify which of them still make sense for their major, which ones need to be changed, and which ones require revised assessment tools for successful measurement.

b) Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research, or Service (UW accreditation themes, NWCCU Standard I.B.1, 1.B.2, 4.A.1)

In all cases, the outcomes addressed were for teaching.

c) What type of data did you collect to assess this goal (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making.
The data collected was in the form of portfolios. The precise content of these portfolios varies by major, but they all include writing samples from a range of contexts (critical analysis, creative expression, etc.) as well as a reflective essay in which students consider their development during their time in the IAS program. Some portfolios included exit surveys, language tests, or other tools specific to a given major.

d) Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)?

No additional sources were used this year.

e) Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty, and suggestions made for program improvement as a result. 4.A.3, 4.B.1

Faculty members affiliated with particular majors met at various times and locations during the spring quarter to discuss the findings of the assessment process and make recommendations for changes and improvements to the assessment process, curriculum, and other aspects of the program. The outcomes of these meetings are documented in the Summary of Assessment Activities in IAS (2013-2014).

f) Document how you made the results available to appropriate constituencies. (4.B. 1, 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students).

Results have not yet been made available to any constituencies.

Academic Assessment Committee

Summary of Assessment Activities in IAS, 2013-2014

Annual Report

Prepared by David Coon, Assistant Professor, IAS

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the IAS program phased out its general portfolio and replaced that with major-specific portfolios. Students admitted at a time when the old portfolios were in place had the option of completing the IAS version or the major-specific version. During 2013-2014, the majority of portfolios submitted were in the major-specific format. This year’s reports, therefore, represent the first round of assessment specifically tailored to the SLOs of individual majors.

Across IAS, graduating seniors were required to submit a portfolio of their work at the beginning of their final quarter. The items included in portfolios varied by major, but most included early writing samples to provide a benchmark for measuring growth. All portfolios also included some form of reflective essay in which students commented on their growth and learning during their time in IAS. The other items were chosen to reflect the primary goals of the specific majors, and ranged from critical essays to lab reports to creative projects. Portfolios were collected from all graduating students between spring 2013 and winter 2014, and a sample of that group (10-12 portfolios per major) was selected for review.

Faculty representatives from each major were asked to review the chosen sample and then report their findings to the full faculty within their major. Based on the findings of the reviewers, faculty from each major made decisions about changes or improvements that would need to be made in order to ensure student success regarding achievement of stated SLOs. The reports of individual majors are attached to this document. (Reports were not submitted for two majors within IAS. Law and Policy is a new major and did not assess any graduates this year. American Studies is in the midst of a restructuring effort, and will begin assessing students when/if the new version of the major is approved. Global Studies (still a concentration rather than a major) was assessed, but no formal report was submitted in time for this summary.)
Findings vary across majors, but all reports note that while student work demonstrates the successful achievement of most SLOs, there is room for improvement in all majors. Some majors have plans to revisit and revise existing SLOs, while others are considering curriculum revisions to help students achieve the existing SLOs. In the spring of 2014 the IAS faculty decided to eliminate the portfolio as a requirement for graduation, and while some majors indicate a desire to continue using portfolios as their primary assessment tool, other majors are beginning to generate new tools that they believe will allow them to assess student and faculty performance more accurately.

Assessment of the MAIS program is not currently being conducted, but a committee is working to develop a process.

I recommend that next year, as part of their annual reports, each major should be asked to revisit their reports from this year and provide status updates about all of the changes that they indicated they would make. Additionally, I recommend that although each major will be responsible for generating and implementing its own assessment tools, majors should work together to share ideas and strategies that might be beneficial across IAS. Communication across majors and divisions will be crucial in this process.

**Assessment Reports by Division/Major**

1. **Culture, Arts, and Communication**
   a) Arts, Media, and Culture  
   b) Communication  
   c) Hispanic Studies  
   d) Writing Studies

2. **Politics, Philosophy, and Public Affairs**
   a) Politics, Philosophy, and Economics

3. **Quantitative and Environmental Sciences and Studies**
   a) Environmental Science  
   b) Environmental Studies

4. **Social, Behavioral, and Human Sciences**
   a) Psychology  
   b) IAS Major

5. **Social and Historical Studies**
   a) Ethnic, Gender, and Labor Studies  
   b) History

**Portfolio Evaluation Summary – AMC 2014**

**Summary**

In April, 2014, I invited AMC faculty to serve on a task force to review our major’s portfolios. Ed Chamberlain and Nicole Blair volunteered. Our goals were 1) to assess the degree to which graduating students were meeting the major’s Student Learning Objectives (SLOs); 2) to evaluate the effectiveness of the portfolio in allowing us to meet our first goal, especially in light of the new portfolio checklist, which was based on the general IAS checklist but tailored last year to AMC; and 3) to identify ways in which the AMC curriculum could more effectively support its stated SLOs. In short, we found that 1)
when the portfolio and curriculum work effectively together, graduating AMC students are meeting or exceeding the major’s SLOs; 2) the revised portfolio is significantly more effective in facilitating our assessment of students, but further revisions are needed; and 3) AMC needs to continue to develop more courses in support of the first SLO, which is the objective most distinctive to AMC.

Procedure

Each task force member chose 4 portfolios from the last academic year (with an eye to a rough distribution across the various quarters) and all of us reviewed all 12 portfolios, using the rubric devised by David Coon last year, which uses the language of the AMC SLOs. We met to discuss our findings on May 13 and then reported to the full AMC faculty on May 16. This report takes both discussions into account.

Detailed Findings

All our findings refer to the current AMC SLOs:

Student learning outcomes

When you have finished the course work for this major, you are expected to meet these learning outcomes.

• You will cultivate insight unique to human beings and will be able to identify and explain interrelations among texts of apparently disparate discourses: literature, film and visual arts.
• You will acquire the interpretive skills necessary to analyze individual texts of various kinds - literary, filmic, art, televisual, musical - closely and critically. Students will be not just literate but visually or audiovisually literate.
• You will understand the importance of history and culture as they shape and are in turn shaped by arts and media.
• You will gain practical experience in the creative processes of one of the arts or media studied in the major.
• You will be able to express the knowledge and experience described in the items listed above in clear, concise and persuasive writing.

As we reviewed the portfolios this year, we kept in mind the findings of a report done in April 2013 by Bill Kunz, David Coon, and Nicole Blair (attached). It was never officially presented to the full AMC faculty, but it is instructive to compare our findings with regard to each SLO with those of this helpful report.

As for the first SLO, the 2013 task force “felt that they did not have enough information to determine student success. While portfolio submissions often addressed literature, film, or visual arts, they did not emphasize relationships between them. The reviewers felt that this did not represent a failure on the part of the students, but rather reflected the fact that few, if any, courses within the major ask students to compare different kinds of discourses in a single assignment. Thus, students may not have any work to submit that would address this SLO, and even if they do, the portfolio instructions do not include any request for students to submit this kind of work.” The 2014 task force came to the same conclusions. Yet since we regard that SLO as the one most definitive of AMC, we prefer to retain it and strive to meet it in our curriculum rather than to change it. It so happens that just this academic year Ed and Nicole proposed a new class, Literature and the Arts (TLIT 220), in two iterations: Ed will teach it next year with an emphasis on visual arts; Nicole will teach it the following year with an emphasis on music. Our hope
is that they and other faculty can teach the class frequently in future years, and that eventually this class
or others like it could become a required gateway course for AMC. (Ed and Nicole have similar classes in
mind.) AMC faculty plan to continue to discuss this SLO and be mindful of it as we introduce new classes
and improve old ones. In the meantime, we plan to continue to use the current AMC portfolio checklist,
which does not require an essay that meets this SLO strictly (i.e., a study of the interrelation of disparate
texts in a single essay), but we will add language encouraging students to include essays that do. In this
way, we should be able to monitor our progress toward our ultimate goal, that every AMC graduate
meet this SLO.

Whereas the 2013 task force found that student success with regard to the second and third SLOs was
“hit and miss,” the 2014 task force agreed that all 12 students satisfied these learning objectives.
Moreover, we found that the second SLO (interpretative skills) seems to mark the strength of AMC
students, who often demonstrated proficiency in several of their essays. As the 2013 task force noted,
the AMC-specific portfolio checklist (unlike the generic IAS checklist) calls specifically for essays that
demonstrate these two SLOs, and that seems to have made the difference. The wording of the third
SLO and that of the corresponding item on the portfolio checklist differ somewhat, but the AMC faculty
concluded that the difference was inconsequential or even helpful insofar as it made students reflect on
the skill and knowledge the SLO is intended to measure.

The 2013 task force noted that even the new portfolio checklist only invites a creative work but does not
require one. Even though the students in the 2014 sample were more likely to submit a creative work
than their counterparts in 2013, many still did not. All of those who did, however, had received above-
average or excellent grades (3.0-4.0) from their original instructors. The AMC faculty agreed with the
2014 task force’s recommendation that the revised checklist require a creative work; since every
student is required to take a class from List D: Practice/Studio, each student should have at least one
such work. The revised portfolio checklist will retain the language about “best work in the AMC major”
but place it elsewhere.

Finally, like the 2013 task force, the 2014 task force was pleased to find that all 12 AMC students met or
exceeded the fifth SLO, about good writing.

Conclusion

The 2014 portfolio task force believes that AMC students are adequately meeting the four SLOs that the
AMC curriculum supports, and that AMC as a whole has plans to continue to improve the match
between its curriculum and the first SLO. In addition, the portfolio as redesigned in 2013 does a better
job than the previous version in allowing us to assess student achievement, and the revised version for
next year will be a further improvement. With all this in mind, we find it likely that AMC will retain the
portfolio as its main means of assessing student learning in the immediate future.

Joe Sharkey

Arts, Media, & Culture Coordinator, 2013-14

Portfolio Evaluation Summary – COM – 2014

During spring quarter 2014, Ji-Hyun Ahn, David Coon, and Alex Smith reviewed a sample of portfolios
collected from graduating Communication majors between spring 2013 and winter 2014. Each of the
reviewers evaluated the same ten portfolios, five of which were from students on the professional track
and five of which were from the research track. The reviewers met on May 2 to discuss and compare
their findings, focusing on the portfolios’ demonstration of the Student Learning Outcomes established
for the Communication major. The following is a summary of those findings.
The reviewers felt that the overall writing abilities demonstrated by the sampled portfolios were average to above average and generally showed progress from the first paper to later papers.

With respect to the major’s first identified SLO, which says that students will be able to “conduct thorough and critical research,” the reviewers noted that many of the portfolios did not contain any papers with more than a small handful of supporting sources. In some cases the sources were of questionable reliability and quality. Most students did demonstrate an understanding of how to find and incorporate scholarly sources as part of their work. The reviewers felt that a clearer definition of what counts as research in our courses might be beneficial for both the students and the faculty who are evaluating them.

A second SLO notes that students will understand “media’s power to convey ideologies” with respect to various socially constructed identity categories. The samples suggested that all of the students understood the significance of ideologies as part of media studies, but only a handful demonstrated a complex understanding of how ideologies work within the media.

Regarding the major SLO about the “ethical, legal, political, and economic contexts” of media, the reviewers felt that some students did an excellent job while others were missing the mark. This may reflect the students’ choice of papers more than their understanding of the concepts, and it may also reflect the nature of the assignments that students are being given. Without assignments that specifically require discussions of context, students may not generate any such paper that could be submitted in the portfolio.

Similarly, with respect to understanding the “interdependence of global media systems,” those students who submitted papers related to this topic seemed to have a very strong understanding of the concept. But many students did not include such an assignment (none was requested for the portfolio) so it was often difficult to measure success in this area.

Students’ ability to demonstrate a “critical and/or historical approach to media” was inconsistent. Most of the sampled portfolios did provide evidence of successful critical engagement with media, but few demonstrated any historical approach. This may have to do with the fact that such a concept is not covered in the portfolio requirements, and it may also reflect the nature of paper assignments coming from COM classes, very few of which focus on historical study.

The COM major includes two SLOs related to professional skills and readiness for professional work in various media production fields. Despite being SLOs for the entire major, they really only apply directly to those students who choose the professional track. Research track students are not asked to submit materials to address these SLOs, and it is unlikely that they would be able to do so if asked. Those students who did submit such materials represented a range of different skills, including video production, journalism, and print design. The reviewers felt that these were somewhat difficult to evaluate thoroughly, given that the projects were frequently beyond the expertise of the faculty members providing the evaluations.

Recommendations
Based on the portfolio review process, and with the understanding that our major will be creating new assessment tools for implementation in the coming year, the review committee offers the following suggestions to be considered by the faculty members associated with the communication major:

- The reflective essay is a valuable component of the assessment process, and we recommend keeping it, even if the portfolio is eliminated. We recommend adding to the essay by asking students to synthesize material learned from various classes, and by asking them about their future plans (i.e. what do they hope to do with their degree, or what do they feel qualified to do with their degree).
- If SLOs for the major will be revised, consider creating two sets of SLOs to reflect the differences between the two tracks. Some SLOs make sense for both, but others do not.
- In the process of generating new assessment tools and new SLOs, be sure that the two match so that the new assessment process will, in fact, be able to measure the SLOs that are established.
- Once new SLOs are in place, the curriculum should be reviewed to make sure that students in the major will, in fact, accomplish the objectives that we lay out for them. (For example, if we continue to include an SLO that focused on global media, students should perhaps be required to take a global media course.)
- Consider adding a capstone course, some kind of seminar (perhaps a 1-2 credit course), or perhaps comprehensive exams that would allow for the successful measurement of all of the SLOs established for the major.

**Decisions and Plans for the Coming Year**

At a meeting of the full time communication faculty held on May 21, 2014, those in attendance (Ji-Hyun Ahn, David Coon, Chris Demaske, Bill Kunz, Ellen Moore, and Alex Smith) discussed the findings and recommendations of the portfolio review committee and made the following decisions:

- This summer, available faculty members (Demaske, Moore, and Coon volunteered; others may join) will work on a list of revised SLOs, creating separate lists for the research track and professional track (with overlap where appropriate).
- Also over the summer, faculty will develop alternative tools that can be used for assessment, and which will ultimately replace the portfolios that are currently in use. Some ideas to be considered include replacing the existing reflective essay with a questionnaire that addresses some of the same ideas in a more targeted manner; collecting contact information from graduating seniors so that we can track their professional trajectories after they leave UWT; creating a 1-2 credit hour seminar for graduating seniors that would include activities specifically designed to synthesize material from the major and assess student learning along with professionalization activities and workshops.
- In late summer or early fall, the new SLOs and assessment tools will be reviewed, potentially revised, and ultimately approved by all full time COM faculty members so that they may be implemented by the end of the quarter.
- After the new SLOs are in place, we will review the COM curriculum and major requirements to ensure that students will achieve the learning outcomes established for them.
**Report prepared by David Coon, Coordinator for the Communication major**

April 29, 2014

To: Chris Demaske and Emily Ignacio

From: Cynthia Duncan

RE: HISPANIC STUDIES PORTFOLIO REVIEW 2014

Hispanic Studies is a new major, and 2014 is the first year that we have graduating seniors. Based on the review of these portfolios, we have prepared the following assessment report using the student learning objectives for Hispanic Studies to measure outcome.

Our stated learning objectives are:

1. Develop oral, writing and reading proficiency in Spanish at the Advanced Level as defined by American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards.

2. Become knowledgeable about the complexity of cultures in the Spanish-speaking world and be able to engage in ongoing critical debate about them.

3. Acquire proficiency in the 5 Cs (communication, cultures, connections, comparisons, communities) for language studies in Spanish as defined by the National Foreign Language Standards.

4. Learn terminology and concepts from at least two of these fields: literature and literary criticism; film and film criticism; cultural studies and cultural theory, and be able to apply the terminology and concepts to the critical analysis of works from Spain, Spanish America, and U.S. Latinos.

5. Become global citizens, able to interact compassionately, intelligently and insightfully with other cultures, particularly those of the Spanish-speaking world, and to engage in the scholarship and activism that constitute Hispanic Studies in the U.S.

6. Acquire competence necessary for employment in a variety of fields related to the Spanish language and literary and cultural studies and/or a graduate program in Spanish or Latin American Studies.

Based on our study of the portfolios, we believe that our portfolio requirements allow us to assess each of these areas satisfactorily. Specifically, the collection of writing samples reveals the student's level of linguistic proficiency in Spanish as well as knowledge of the culture. They allow us to assess the student's understanding and use of grammar, along with the ability to use correct terminology and concepts to analyze film and literature or other cultural constructs, and to engage in critical thought. As part of the process of creating the portfolio, students are required to do self-assessment of their strengths and areas for improvement based on their classwork over a period of time. We also require peer review and instructor evaluation of specific skills as part of the portfolio, which provide additional insight into the student's abilities. The student's self-reflective essay focuses on his or her ability to engage in meaningful ways with native speakers of Spanish in a real world setting, as demonstrated through study abroad or experiential learning (internships). The essay also addresses how acquired skills can translate to the work place and/ or graduate study in the field. Through oral interviews with the students, we are able to measure oral/ aural proficiency, and also determine cultural competency and critical thinking by discussing topics related to the Hispanic world. We are satisfied that the major, as currently constructed, encourages students to behave as global citizens and engage in scholarship and activism related to Hispanic issues.
It is apparent from our review of the portfolios that both native speakers of Spanish and students of Spanish as a second language work hard to meet our learning outcomes, see them as meaningful challenges, and feel a sense of accomplishment upon meeting them successfully. Although natives speak Spanish fluently, they seldom have backgrounds in grammar, morphology and syntax. Their reading and writing skills are not developed when they enter the program. Through classes like Advanced Grammar, Research Methods and the Writing Process, Composition and Stylistics, Introduction to Hispanic Literary Studies, and Introduction to Hispanic Cultural Studies, they acquire the level of sophistication expected from a well-educated native speaker. They struggle to improve spelling, writing style, use of grammar, they master a more complex vocabulary, and they learn critical thinking skills to analyze works of literature and film. They gain an historical overview of Latin American and Spanish culture, and acquire more knowledge of Latino culture in the USA. Students of Spanish as a second language face slightly different challenges. They must first master the language and gain higher-level proficiency in order to engage in the kind of intellectual and critical debate we expect in our 300-400 level classes. However, through intensive language skills acquisitions classes such as TSPAN 301, 302 and 303, especially when combined with study abroad, our students achieve Advanced Level as defined by ACTFL, and are able to write and speak on abstract topics with almost the same fluency as native speakers. We stress the importance of offering small classes at the advanced level so that every individual has the maximum opportunity for linguistic development.

The study abroad/ experiential learning component of the program is important because it allows the student to use Spanish in a setting beyond the classroom. It also fosters global citizenship and promotes greater cultural competency. Internships, in particular, help prepare the student for work experiences, and study abroad provides an immersion experience in the language and culture that greatly enhances the student's abilities. We want to preserve these opportunities for students.

In compliance with the request from administrators to focus on one specific SLO and comment more extensively on it, we chose goal number 1, namely that of linguistic proficiency. We noted that the students had mastered complex grammatical concepts such as the use of the subjunctive in nominal, adjectival and adverbial clauses, sequence of tenses, the use of the imperfect versus the preterite, distinctions between ser and estar, agreement between subject/verb and noun/adjective, the correct use of all pronoun forms, and idiomatic structures such as gustar. Students were able to write complex sentences using a good variety of vocabulary appropriate for the topic under discussion, and communicated their thoughts clearly in writing and speaking. Their reading skills were measured by their ability to understand and write about a variety of literary and non-literary texts, such as poems, novels, short stories, memoirs, newspaper stories, history books, and scholarly articles on film and literature.

Their aural/ oral proficiency showed the ability to communicate effectively in classroom discussions, give oral reports, lead class discussions, and communicate with native speakers in a variety of settings. They were able to sustain lengthy discussions in Spanish with relative ease. These findings support the continued offering of upper division coursework taught entirely in Spanish aimed at students with Intermediate High to Advanced proficiency skills. They also confirm the importance of offering both language skills acquisitions classes and classes with a cultural focus at the 300/400 level, as both contribute to the students' growth in linguistic and cultural competency.
While it is still early in the process, we are satisfied that our assessment tools are helping us evaluate the program in a meaningful way, and we also satisfied that our program is meeting the stated learning objectives. We recommend no changes at this time.
Writing Studies Senior Portfolio Assessment Report:

Submitted by Michael Kula, May 20, 2014, as reviewed and approved by members of the Writing Studies Program

Overview:

As required by IAS/Writing Studies, all seniors graduating with a major in Writing Studies submitted their portfolios for faculty review. Although the major currently has six students with senior standing, only one will be graduating in spring 2014. The other five have deferred and will be completing their studies this summer, with their portfolio submissions to follow thereafter, and so this assessment report reflects the review of just a single portfolio.

For seniors graduating in the Creative Writing track, each graduating senior’s portfolio is required to contain the following items:

1. A Writing Studies portfolio checklist.
2. An early sample of your creative writing in the genre in which you specialized.
3. An example of what you feel is your best work in your genre of specialization.
4. A sample of your work in a second genre you’ve studied
5. A sample of your academic writing from an upper division course in the major in which you critically analyzed a professional text
6. A reflective essay in which you reflect on how the material included in your portfolio represents your growth and development as a writer and how it relates to your intended career path or your life after UW Tacoma.

In their review, faculty readers were asked to assess the level to which the portfolio documents the achievement of the Writing Studies major’s learning outcomes, which for 2013-2014 are:

1. Write effectively in a range of genres.
2. Think critically and creatively.
3. Be verbally and visually literate in a manner that encourages your growth as learners, citizens and professionals.
4. Acquire a well-rounded liberal arts education in the sciences and the humanities.
5. Acquire solid skills for seeking employment involving writing, including careers in education, publishing, public relations, grant writing and marketing.
6. Acquire a strong base with which to pursue a Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing.
7. Be prepared for writing jobs in a variety of fields.
8. Use technology integral to a writing profession.

Procedure:

Once the portfolio was submitted to IAS for review, the Writing Studies faculty called for volunteers to participate in the review. Four faculty (three lecturers, one tenure track) volunteered, and along with
the major coordinator, all were given access to the Canvas site where the portfolio materials were available. Each volunteer was then asked to review the documents and submit a one-page report addressing the following:

1. Document any SLOs that were UN-assessable in the portfolio
2. Select one SLO that the portfolio documented to the highest degree of success
3. Select one SLO that the portfolio documented to the lowest degree of success

Observations:
The observations here are a summation of the comments provided by the faculty in their reports.

1. Document any SLOs that were UN-assessable in the portfolio—

All reviewers commented that several (in fact, the majority) of the current SLOs were un-assessable and most commented that the fault seemed not with the contents of the portfolio, but with the construction of the learning outcomes themselves. Three reviewers noted that the language of the SLOs was not consistent with assessment best-practices, in that they failed to use demonstrable verbs or they relied on outcomes that could only be evidenced by work beyond the period of study in the program. On these grounds, the following SLOs were questioned:

• Be verbally and visually literate in a manner that encourages your growth as learners, citizens and professionals.
• Acquire a well-rounded liberal arts education in the sciences and the humanities.
• Acquire solid skills for seeking employment involving writing, including careers in education, publishing, public relations, grant writing and marketing.
• Acquire a strong base with which to pursue a Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing.
• Be prepared for writing jobs in a variety of fields.
• Use technology integral to a writing profession.

2. Select one SLO that the portfolio documented to the highest degree of success

On this point, three of the reviewers singled out SLO #2 (Think critically and creatively) as a point of highest success. Readers noted that the diversity of work included and the general strength of the writing in multiple genres was noteworthy, indicating that the student had clearly met the “creative” portion of the SLO. As for the critical portion, the same readers noted that the reflection essay included was sufficiently analytical and self-critical to illustrate the student had developed a critical understanding of her own work and the genres in general.

The fourth reader commented on SLO #5 (Acquire solid skills for seeking employment…) as the greatest strength, making note that the evidence presented in the required revision documentation (a draft and a final) showed remarkable strength in editing. The same reviewer also commented that the student’s reflection, which made note of how her work in the major had prepared her for an internship and part-time employment, showed that she had clearly developed the transferable skills to adapt to the workplace.

3. Select one SLO that the portfolio documented to the lowest degree of success

On this point, readers were split between SLOs #4 and #5, though it should be noted that in each of their responses, reviewers also commented that there were questions about how a portfolio could assess these outcomes (related to workplace preparation and a well-rounded education). Most reviewers on
this point, also repeated their concerns raised about the un-assessability of the SLOs as currently constructed.

Conclusions:

Many of the comments raised by the reviewers mirror concerns previously raised by faculty members about the SLOs during our winter 2014 retreat. At that retreat, faculty supported reexamining the SLOs as part of the in-progress design of the Technical Communication track and the redesign of the Creative Writing track, and so it should be no surprise that this, the first localized assessment of Writing Studies portfolios yielded the same concerns.

In light of this, the most important conclusion that we can draw from this review is that the faculty were correct in their concerns about the SLOs, and their time and efforts to draft new SLOs at the retreat (and subsequently revise them this spring quarter) were well spent. The program faculty remain committed to portfolio assessment for our graduating seniors, and we are confident that the newly revised SLOs for the major (submitted to the university in the 1503 for the Technical Communication Track) are both better designed to be assessable and better illustrative of the goals of the major as a whole.

The newly crafted SLOs for the Writing Studies major are—

As a student in Writing Studies major, you are expected to:

- Write in multiple genres for diverse audiences.
- Apply writing and communication design skills in multiple contexts and for a range of purposes.
- Develop an effective and self-aware writing process from invention to production.
- Collaborate effectively in writing and information design.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the role of writing in creating knowledge through artistic expression, critical inquiry, and applied research.
- Develop the ability to learn, adapt, and use technologies and new media essential to their lives and careers.

Outcomes and Actions:
Based on the results and the evidence in this report, moving forward the Writing Studies faculty will continue this process of assessing the major (and assessing the assessment of the major) in 2014-2015 by:

1. Continuing with implementation of revised SLOs for both (CW and TC) tracks of the major
2. Creating a portfolio review subcommittee within the major faculty to review the required contents of the senior portfolio to ensure all SLOs are documentable by its contents
3. Charging the portfolio review subcommittee to recommend two SLOs to target for 2014-2015 portfolio assessment.
4. Charging the portfolio review subcommittee with drafting an assessment rubric to be used in future years to ensure consistency of approach and comparability of results
5. Collectively creating an assessment grid that maps/connects individual courses to the major learning outcomes they support.
Politics, Philosophy and Public Affairs:
Assessment (2013-14)

Turan Kayaoglu
Michael Forman
Rob Crawford
Will McGuire
Michael Zbaraschuck

Here are our student learning outcomes

• Students will develop a more thorough knowledge of social institutions through focused engagement with both contemporary and enduring social issues.
• Students will strengthen their analytical skills.
• Students will develop their ability to write with style and precision.
• Students will become more competent with quantitative analysis.
• Students will develop their ethical and logical reasoning.
• And students will learn to synthesize and evaluate information through an application of knowledge and methods across different disciplines.

Individual Faculty Assessments

Turan Kayaoglu
I think we are doing a modestly good job on three areas: institutions, writing, and interdisciplinarity. Compared to an average freshman or sophomore, our graduating students seem to have a better understanding of institutions such as the state. Overall, their writings are also better than an average freshman or sophomore. While they still have difficulty in formulating clear thesis, writing concisely, and constructing cohesive paragraphs, they understand the problems much easily when you provide feedback and they are often able to solve the problems in the next time around. They are also are fairly good at bringing in other disciplines in their writings. They can, for example, discuss economic foundations of political decisions or political mechanisms that led to particular economics outcomes.

Two areas that they are not showing much improvement are analytical skills and ethics and logical reasoning. They are also not good at understanding arguments presented in texts and offering criticism towards to the main argument. They often confuse argument and evidence for argument or main argument or an example to illustrate the argument. They have difficulty in differentiating a theoretical argument from an empirical one. They also often confuse normative and analytical arguments.

Michael Forman:
Overall, I think we largely meet the objectives of the major, at least those which can be assessed: our students do graduate with greater competences in these areas. But, they are not evenly developed and cannot be.

• Students will develop a more thorough knowledge of social institutions through focused engagement with both contemporary and enduring social issues.

This may be our strongest and most verifiable standard. My impression is that, by the time they graduate, students do know more about institutions, etc., than they did when they started. Still, I would like them to know more. What our majors lack is the kind of contextual knowledge (i.e., history) which,
in my opinion, is necessary to make sense of institutions, whether we are talking about Congress or the banking system.

- Students will strengthen their analytical skills.

I believe we do very well here. However, as I mentioned before, it is difficult to claim that the gains are due to PPE courses/requirements unless we can say that they strengthen these skills in, for example, analyzing the "contemporary and historical institutions governing social decision-making and ... the manner in which societies solve their complex normative challenges."

- Students will develop their ability to write with style and precision.

There is no question in my mind that students have learned to write better. Whether they do so enough, and whether this is something that we, as a major, can enhance without having a clear understanding for the underlying causes of student weaknesses in this area. (In my opinion, the main problem is that students do not know how to read when they begin.)

- Students will become more competent with quantitative analysis.

It’s hard to assess here, but this is an area of weakness. I notice it most when I give students materials which include quantitative analysis. My impression is that few students understand the meaning of basic statistical concepts used in the social sciences. I don't expect students to produce statistical analysis in my classes. Still, for our curriculum it would be very useful if they could read social science work which employs quantitative analysis.

- Students will develop their ethical and logical reasoning.

If I were there to tinker with the SLOs, I would propose splitting this one. Logical reasoning is a fundamental skill which may be covered in the second objective (analytical skills). Ethical reasoning relies on logic, but it has much more specific content.

- And students will learn to synthesize and evaluate information through an application of knowledge and methods across different disciplines.

We seem to be OK here.

**Rob Crawford**

I can say that most met the first SLO. They also showed greatly improved analytical skills. Same with the ability to write with precision (style is another matter). If critical analysis is one dimension of logical thinking, yes students show it --but many really needed a lot of help. And finally, yes, students demonstrated cross-disciplinary work.

**Will McGuire**

1. Students will develop a more thorough knowledge of social institutions through focused engagement with both contemporary and enduring social issues.

I feel best qualified to assess students’ knowledge of markets. Overall, I thought students’ understanding of how markets work and why they are important in society was shallow. I think this is related to the flexibility in our core requirements and the problems associated with bringing theoretical rigor into our upper-division economics courses.
2. **Students will strengthen their analytical skills**

There is an obvious tendency to choose “softball” critiques of one’s own position, but some students did show impressive analytical skills when it came to evaluating the literature. Still, I think students would benefit from more emphasis on critical thinking earlier in the major.

3. **Students will develop their ability to write with style and precision**

There was a wide range of writing abilities. I’m also not sure students are familiar with the resources available through the writing center. I always recommend that numerous students take their papers to the writing center for help, but I don’t think most do. This is frustrating for me as an instructor. The more time I spend building basic writing skills, the less time there is for developing higher-level research skills.

4. **Students will become more competent with quantitative analysis**

Students generally showed a low level of quantitative literacy. Very few students used quantitative evidence to support their arguments in their papers, and students were generally resistant to quantitative discussions of economic concepts.

5. **Students will develop their ethical and logical reasoning**

This seems very similar to #2 to me, but with an explicit emphasis on ethical reasoning. Students came into the course with a very weak background in ethics. I was disappointed to read statements even in final drafts that cast ethical theories as just opinions. This makes me think we need to require at least one intro-level TPHIL course in PP&E.

6. **And students will learn to synthesize and evaluate information through an application of knowledge and methods across different disciplines.**

This one is difficult to assess. I think students recognized the many areas in which ethics and economics overlap, but it’s not clear we intentionally develop that.

**Results from student exit survey omitted from this summary report**

**Overall Faculty Assessment**

First, we need to revisit our SLOs to make sure they capture our shared educational objectives. We all recognize they need revising. Second, our methods requirement is too wide ranging, and also fails to develop the skills we all want students to have in upper division coursework: analytical and critical thinking, and ability to analyze and critique quantitative information. Third, students often take the core subject classes after they have taken upper division work. Fourth, we need to make sure students satisfy their coursework in the sequence intended. In general, more classes should have pre requisites, and we might want to make satisfaction of core classes a requirement for enrollment in the capstone class. Finally, it seems students are quite happy with their education, and see themselves as better prepared than faculty views them.

**Changes Made and Future Recommended Changes**

--After several fairly long meetings, the faculty voted to replace our current core methods requirement (5 credit) with two classes. We are in the process of developing the second class, and will submit the changes via a 1503 soon.
--We are also reconsidering our core requirements, and will be meeting this quarter to vote on some changes.

--We also agreed to review the extent to which our tracks draw on (or do not draw on) the core material by considering the lack of prerequisites for most classes.

--We are considering additional changes so that our capstone seminar class better meets our objectives, and is pitched at a common level, and provides students with a common capstone experience.
Environmental Science Portfolios 2014

Linda Dawson
Julie Eaton
Jack Vincent

Overall impressions of student work
Overall comment: These are much easier to assess when a graded rubric was present.

Content Knowledge: most students were given “meets standards.” A few were given “Above standards” but only sparingly. This category was difficult to assess independently from “Scientific method and data analysis.”

Interdisciplinary application science: Several of these were rated as “could not assess.” Several students submitted the wrong kind of paper (i.e. a science paper). Typically the book review assignment for Environmental Law was used when applicable.

Scientific method and data analysis: Most students were rated as “meets standards.” This category was difficult to judge independently from the “Content knowledge” category.

Communication skills: only writing was judged (no presentation component was present). There was a lot of variability in quality of writing. Some students showed no change (either poor skills remained poor, or strong skills remain strong). Still, most students were rated at “Meets standards”.

Environmental awareness: about half of the students were rated at “could not assess” and half were rated as “meets standards.” Sometime this was assessed with the capstone, sometimes with the Environmental Law book review. In any case, the “ERS reflection” and “Final reflection” were not suitable for this purpose.

Other comments: The reflections suggest that the students really valued their time and academic experience at UWT.

Regarding improvement over time: The most difficult part about grading the portfolios was assessing improvement across each rubric category. We left most blank, as the writings submitted didn't seem to be sufficient to truly assess improvement.
Suggestions for improvement

1. “Scientific method and data analysis” should be combined with “content knowledge” since these were often evaluated simultaneously.

2. “Communication skills” only addresses written work. Previously this item included oral presentation.

3. “Environmental awareness” was surprisingly difficult to assess. The rubric suggests we use their ERS or Final reflections for this item, but it appears students were prompted to reflect upon the skills they have gained at UWT, not their environmental awareness. If we wish to assess this, we should give a writing assignment that asks them to specifically address their knowledge of environmental issues.

4. Changes over time are too difficult to assess. We can ask students their impression, but because we have so many transfer students, we don’t have very many samples of early work, or, the difference between the early and final work are too similar.

5. Graded rubrics should be included with the graded assignment.

6. We need more stringent guidelines on what students can submit. The canvas site should be more aligned with the rubric. Or, we could tie specific rubric elements to specific a course or specific handful of courses.

7. If we continue to use Canvas, we need to institute and enforce a file-naming convention.

We need to be able to mass download files

Summary Letter for the Environmental Studies Portfolio

Overall Assessment of Learning Objectives

The department is meeting standards for all six learning goals given that this was the modal score for the 12 portfolio packets that were reviewed.

What is our biggest strength?

It was very clear that we excel in our ability to provide an interdisciplinary curriculum, as this was a common theme in many of the submitted papers.

Students’ perception of their academic experience at UWT

Students, for the most part, were happy with the education that they received at UWT. They felt challenged on an intellectual level and took away a feeling of being more open-minded. Students also seem to appreciate the breadth of information to which they were exposed at UWT.

One student, however, felt that his experience at UWT lacked adequate focus on skills related to getting a job. He recommended that the junior (TESC 310) and senior seminars (TESC 410) “…could have been spent helping students to make contacts in their field, work on job interview skills or write a CV.” One thought might be to include a “networking requirement” as part of the capstone experience. To satisfy this requirement, students would need to interview a few people in a field (or fields) that interests them.
Assessment of Psychology Major
Spring 2013-Winter 2014
Prepared by Roger Knight & Kima Cargill

OVERVIEW
Psychology Faculty met to assess the Psychology Major. Data included 10 portfolios, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) covered by all psychology courses, and the student survey data. Based on the data examined, Psychology Faculty made the following recommendations: 1) to change the wording of the portfolio instructions regarding the student’s identification of SLO’s, 2) to help students identify which papers/projects are interdisciplinary, 3) to reconsider the SLO of synthesis across disciplines, or to better help students understand what this means, 4) and to discuss how to improve student presentation/speaking skills or their perceptions of these skills.

PORTFOLIOS
There were 171 portfolios completed between Spring 2013 and Winter 2014. Of these, 121 completed the specific Psychology Portfolio requirements. A random number generator was used to generate random numbers from 1 - 121 and we used those numbers to select portfolios from among those that completed the psychology requirements. For each of the ten selected portfolios, one paper from Research Methods was selected and one paper from another psychology class was selected. Using the rubric assessing Psychology Learning Outcomes, each paper was assessed for how well it fit any of the psychology learning outcomes. A single paper could address more than one learning outcome. A paper was counted fulfilling the interpreting research outcome if the student included citations to psychology research paper.

The results for this analysis showed that all of the psychology learning outcomes were addressed by at least one portfolios at a level that was acceptable or above. In addition, two portfolios addressed the student identified objective of learning to work in groups. (See Appendix A for tallies of SLO’s and their ratings.)

Interpretation
These results suggest that most student papers are demonstrating an acceptable level of proficiency for most of the Psychology Major Learning Outcomes; however, the following problems were noted:

1. There is a problem with students’ ability to clearly identify and articulate which papers meet specific learning outcomes. Students are currently given the following instructions for their reflective essay in which they are to identify SLO’s met by the papers in their portfolio: “Detail how the projects in the portfolio demonstrate the accomplishment of the learning outcomes for the Psychology major.” It appears that some student are not aware of or are not referring to the actual Psychology Learning Outcomes on the website, but rather guessing at what a learning outcome is. For example, one student wrote, “The second assignment I have included is a reflective essay I composed in my psychology class on group dynamics. I believe this paper stands out, not merely for its high grade, but for its grasp of the core concepts of the course.” There is no statement of what the core concepts were or how those connect to the psychology major SLO’s.

2. Conversely, there were some papers that clearly met Student Learning Outcomes, but the student did not identify that outcome in their reflective essay. For example, a paper on aggression and the Five Factor Personality Model clearly demonstrated “familiarity with major theoretical
approaches and historical trends in psychology,” but the student did not identify that as a learning outcome demonstrated by that paper.

3. There were few papers demonstrating synthesis across disciplines. The lack of papers addressing the ‘Synthesis of across Disciplines’ outcome even when the instructions were to submit a paper representing an interdisciplinary approach could be interpreted in at least two ways. Students may understand interdisciplinarity as individual differences/diversity and/or the application of psychology to social issues. On the other hand, students may simply not have examples of interdisciplinary papers to put in their portfolios.

4. Many of the reflective essays in the portfolios appeared to be hastily written, had incomplete sentences, and had not been spell-checked. This was even true for portfolios which contained exemplary writing, suggesting that even outstanding students are spending a few minutes, at best, assembling their portfolios and writing their reflective essays.

REVIEW OF LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR PSYCHOLOGY COURSES

Appendix B shows the courses taught by regular Psychology faculty over the period analyzed. Because approximately half of the psychology courses did not identify specific psychology student learning outcomes in their syllabi it was not possible to meaningfully assess how well the curriculum is addressing learning outcomes. Ideally the 2015 assessment will include complete data.

SENIOR SURVEY

The 2014 Senior Survey reports the results from 172 psychology students. The survey includes multi-item questions asking students to make self-assessments of their mastery using a Likert scale for each of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s) and assess the extent to which the Psychology Major courses met the education goals of the SLO’s. In general, students rated themselves and psychology courses highly on the scale with respect to the SLO’s.

Student Skills Self-Assessment

Analysis of the student survey data suggests areas of potential strengths and weaknesses of student mastery of SLO’s. Learning outcomes related to understanding social issues, core concepts and methodologies of psychology, and diversity received the highest ratings with about 89% or more of students rating themselves as “very good” or “excellent” in these areas. In contrast, learning outcomes related to psychology research such as applying scientific methods received the lowest ratings on the scale, but the majority of students still rated themselves highly with about 75% of students rating themselves as “very good” or “excellent”. See Appendix C for complete student ratings.

The survey asked students about their mastery of other academic skills that are not explicitly addressed by the SLO’s. Skill categories that include independent learning and finding information for decision-making/problem solving were the highest rated with 93% or more of students rating themselves as “very good” or “excellent”. Presentation and speaking skills were rated the lowest with 55% of students rating themselves as “very good” or “excellent”. It is worth noting that even though students rated themselves very high in finding information for decision-making/problem solving (93%), a separate item assessing problem solving/critical thinking/writing skills was rated relatively low with only 81% of students rating themselves as “very good” or “excellent”.

Student Assessment of Psychology Major Courses

The Psychology Major courses were rated highly in terms of the degree to which they met the educational goals of the SLO’s. Ninety percent or more of the students reported “mostly” or “totally”
(two highest response items) the degree to which the courses met the goal of each SLO. Learning outcomes related to diversity and social issues received the highest ratings of 97% or better. Research-related activities received the lowest ratings, yet still 90% of students reported “mostly” or “totally”. Overall, students judge the Psychology Major courses as meeting the SLO’s.

Student Assessment of Educational Opportunities

Students reported how frequently they were exposed to different types of educational opportunities and practices. Several points are worth mentioning. The number of opportunities to “think critically” was the highest rated with 92% of students reporting “frequently” or “nearly always”. Opportunities related to diversity issues were second highest rated. Opportunities for oral presentation were rated “frequently” or “nearly always” by 56% of students. Opportunities for math/quantitative analyses and fieldwork were rated the lowest with 19% and 13%, respectively, of students reporting “frequently” or “nearly always”.

Summary

On the face of it, these high ratings suggest that most students are mastering the SLO’s based on their educational experience at UWT and through their psychology courses. Alternatively, the high ratings may reflect the Dunning-Kruger effect with students over estimating their abilities or, perhaps, responding in a way they believe is socially desirable. Notably, many researchers have recently described college students of the so-called millennial generation as individuals who characteristically overestimate their ability level compared to their same-aged peers around the world. Whatever the reason, there appears to be some discordance between student self-assessment and the faculty evaluation of student portfolios. Based on a selected sample of student papers, students appear to be over estimating their abilities in the survey. However, the overall high ratings seem to imply that students are satisfied with their education as it relates to the SLO’s.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that all psychology faculty be reminded that each course syllabus specifically identify psychology SLO’s. There are a number of ways we may increase compliance. For example, we might have a spreadsheet on the psychology faculty workspace page that lists courses where each faculty can edit the document and simply check a box corresponding to the SLO’s addressed by a given course. A better option might be to use the Canvas “Outcomes” feature which allows instructors to link course objectives to departmentally defined outcomes, but that would require that all instructors use Canvas for their courses.

2. Because students are having difficulty identifying the psychology SLO’s, we may want to consider providing a template for them to follow that require them to respond directly to each of the SLOs instead of the free-form essay format. This may also address the problem of the portfolio reflective essays being hastily and sloppily written.

3. We may want to rethink as a faculty the SLO of synthesis across disciplines. We should consider whether this is a realistic outcome and/or whether or not we should change how we articulate this outcome to students and provide better examples.

4. We should discuss why students might be rating themselves low on speaking and presentation skills and how we might address that through the curriculum.
IAS Major Assessment

2013-2014

Prepared by Nita McKinley & Lauren Montgomery

Overview

Ten randomly selected portfolios were reviewed to rate examples of the four IAS Major Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Results showed that most portfolios contained Distinguished, Good, or Acceptable examples of each of the SLOs. Recommendations included 1) a review of the coursework for the IAS Major to ensure all SLOs are adequately addressed and 2) designing additional self-assessments.

Portfolio Review Method

Sixty-five student portfolios were submitted to the Canvas IAS Major Portfolio between Spring 2013 and Winter 2014 (see Appendix A for IAS Major Portfolio Requirements). Using a random number generator, 10 portfolios were selected for review. Two portfolios were assigned to each of the five divisions of IAS for review. Divisions assigned to the portfolios to either 1 or 2 reviewers. There were a total of 6 different reviewers.

Reviewers were asked to read through each portfolio and rate how well the materials in the portfolio reflected examples of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the IAS Major. Reviewers could also write narrative comments about the portfolio being reviewed.

SLO Rubric Ratings (see Appendix B)

1. Understand the interdisciplinary nature of local, regional, national and global issues.

Only one portfolio was reported as not having an example of this SLO. Of the remaining portfolios, 50% (5) of the portfolios had “Distinguished” or “Good” examples of this SLO, 20% (2) had “Acceptable” examples, and 20% (2) had “Unacceptable” examples of this SLO. Thus, 70% of the sample demonstrated this SLO at “Acceptable” or above.

2. Develop skills in written, oral and visual communication and interpretation vital to success in any field of knowledge or profession.

For this SLO, 70% (7) of the portfolios had “Distinguished” or “Good” examples and 30% (3) had “Acceptable” examples. Thus all portfolios in the sample demonstrated this SLO at “Acceptable” or above. One reviewer noted that only written communication was demonstrated by the portfolio.

3. Improve critical thinking skills that lead to the development of informed and involved citizenry.

For this SLO, 60% (6) of the portfolio had “Distinguished” or “Good” examples and 40% (4) had “Acceptable” examples. Thus all portfolios in the sample demonstrated this SLO at “Acceptable” or above.

4. Improve the understanding of the methodologies used by the humanities, social sciences and the natural sciences, and of the ways these methodologies complement each other in the examination of complex ideas.

Only one portfolio was reported as not having an example of this SLO. Of the remaining portfolios, 40% (4) of the portfolios had “Distinguished” or “Good” examples of this SLO, 30% (3) had “Acceptable” examples, and 20% (2) had “Unacceptable” examples of this SLO. Thus, 70% of the sample demonstrated this SLO at “Acceptable” or above. One reviewer noted that the portfolio reviewed only demonstrated understanding of methodologies of the humanities and social sciences.
Narrative Comments (see Appendix C)
Many of the reviewers noted improvement in the students’ writing and critical thinking skills in comparing the early and later writing samples. Many of the portfolios were commended for their demonstration of critical thinking and writing skills.

There were also a significant number comments about the lack of interdisciplinarity in the examples. There was also concern that the reviewer did not have access to the context of a given paper: what the assignment was, the course, and when in the students’ career the course was taken. This made it difficult to evaluate the finished writing example.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Overall, most portfolios demonstrated at least acceptable examples of each of the SLOs for the IAS Major. Both the “understand the interdisciplinary nature of local, regional, national and global issues” and “improve the understanding of the methodologies used by the humanities, social sciences and the natural sciences, and of the ways these methodologies complement each other in the examination of complex ideas” SLOs were missing for at least one portfolio and 20% of the portfolios had unacceptable examples of this SLO. IAS Major faculty may want to examine how these SLOs are addressed in the coursework for the major.

IAS is currently reviewing assessment strategies, and the portfolios are likely to be eliminated and replaced with another form of evaluation. In thinking about which aspects of the portfolios were helpful, and which were not, we think the reflective essays were useful because they included the student’s own assessment of their education, while directly demonstrating writing skills and the reflective thinking and critical analysis of their own work, development and experiences. The assignments can be helpful, and usually demonstrate progress and something about the level of academic development in the student, but without context of the assignment they can be difficult to assess. This is particularly true with the IAS major, because the faculty assessing the major don’t necessarily have much knowledge about individual classes the student may have taken in this interdisciplinary major. Since the self-assessments are so valuable, future assessments might use more of them. For example, a survey-type self-assessment combined with a written narrative might be useful.

As IAS transitions from the use of portfolios to other assessment methods, other more useful methods of evaluating the IAS major will need to be developed.

**Appendices omitted from this summary report; available by contacting David Coon at drcoon@uw.edu.
EGL Major Assessment
2013-2014
Prepared by Ariana Camacho, Cynthia Howson, Emily Ignacio, and Natalie Jolly

Overview
EGLS faculty (Ariana Ochoa Camacho, Cynthia Howson, Emily Noelle Ignacio, and Natalie Jolly) met to
discuss how portfolios would be reviewed for this AY 2013-14. We intend to use the assessment to
begin a discussion among all EGLS faculty, in hopes of crafting a new method of assessing our SLOs that
can be put into place starting AY 2014-15. All thirteen portfolios (submitted between Spring 2013-
Winter 2014) were reviewed – most thoroughly by Drs. Camacho and Howson - to assess of the three
EGLS Major Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). The results are presented below. Recommendation
included re-designing our portfolio requirement for the major.

Portfolio Review Method
Nineteen student portfolios were submitted to the Canvas EGLS Major Portfolio between Spring 2013
and Winter 2014 (see Appendix A for EGLS Major Portfolio Requirements). Six submitted portfolios using
the IAS General Portfolio guidelines. Thirteen used the newer EGLS guidelines. These thirteen portfolios
were selected for review. There were a total of 4 different reviewers.

Reviewers were asked to read each portfolio submission and analyze how well the materials in the
portfolio reflected examples of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the EGLS Major. Reviewers
met on May 16th to discuss their findings. Two re-evaluated all thirteen after our initial briefing and
provided a more detailed summary (below).

SLO Rubric Ratings (see Appendix B)
1) Learn to assess socially meaningful identities in a variety of cultural and critical contexts, and to
   communicate across social boundaries in a multi-cultural world.
2) Learn how to integrate and link ethnic, gender and labor studies.
3) Develop comparative research and critical thinking skills for understanding the range of lived
   experiences in local and global communities and to understand how power operates in society.
4) Develop research and writing skills in an integrative learning approach including a range of
   humanities and social science perspectives.
5) Understand various analytical and/or rhetorical frameworks related to various areas of study
   within ethnic, gender and labor studies and relevant to the world of work, civic engagement and
   community development.

Narrative Comments
Reviewers noted improvement in the students’ writing and critical thinking skills in comparing the early
and later writing samples. Many of the portfolios were commended for their demonstration of critical
thinking, writing, and research skills, including engagement with sophisticated texts. Many of the
portfolios demonstrated engagement with issues of power in society and critical engagement with at
least one of the key areas (race/ethnicity, gender, or class).

There is significant room for improvement in students’ ability to integrate and link ethnic, gender, and
labor studies (SLO #3). Portfolios also reflected difficulty applying analytical frameworks to specific
contexts of civic engagement and community development (SLO #5). Fewer than 25% of portfolios demonstrated these SLOs.

The portfolios of the two weakest students were not acceptable according to any of the SLOs. More concerning are the portfolios of two strong students whose work is very good, but who do not engage meaningfully or explicitly with ethnic, gender and labor studies.

Conclusions and Recommendations
Overall, most portfolios demonstrated acceptable elements of each of the SLOs for the EGLS Major. Reviewers noted that assignments do not lend themselves to the application of analytical frameworks to specific communities or to the intersection of lived experiences in local and global communities (SLO #5). EGLS faculty may want to examine how these SLOs are addressed in the coursework for the major.

Students’ difficulty dealing explicitly with intersectionality and linking ethnic, gender, and labor studies, more likely reflects the more advanced cognitive development required for this task. It is for this reason that we recommend a specific course designed for this purpose. EGLS faculty will continue to review assessment strategies, but we have concluded that students need an opportunity to revise existing work with the specific objective of integrating and linked different forms of identity and power relations.
2014 History BA Graduate Portfolio Synopsis

By Mike Allen, THIST 498 Capstone Instructor

This year’s Capstone cadre of 14 majors produced 13 portfolios, with one student dropping the class. Portfolios contained a reflective statement, sample of early written work, and three other papers as per IAS requirements. In addition, Capstone students included a resume and their TIAS 497 senior paper in their portfolios.

The only criterion for judging portfolios other than IAS requirements was whether the portfolio was turned in on time. A few portfolios were missing items which eventually arrived. All in all, the procedure and evaluation went well considering this is the first time it has been done in the Capstone context. Portfolio grades ranged from A to C on a 25 point scale. There were no D’s or F’s.

With the History student learning objectives in hand, one can make some generalizations and form conclusions. In varying degrees, the portfolios reflect the students’ ability to produce essays with thesis statements supported by primary and secondary source evidence. There are solid introductions and conclusions. The portfolios reflect knowledge of diverse areas of history and historiography. In varying degrees, all of the elements of the portfolio were acceptable, and most were above average.

Early writing samples reflected problems with prose, and some of these problems lingered in later work. Transitions are not always smooth and there are occasionally sentence fragments. Some had mastered the historiography of their particular topics better than others. While all students conducted primary source research, some could have dug harder, especially in archival sources.

All in all, each of the portfolios reflected student progress and maturation as scholars. Each portfolio successfully met student learning objectives in varying degrees.
1. **Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.**

The three undergraduate programs will be preparing for an accreditation visit in October 2016. In order to prepare for this visit, assessment classes have been presented and assessment is discussed at every monthly program curriculum meeting.

a) Computer Science and Systems – Has a rotating system of data collection events to support the assessment of student learning. In the planning stages is a meeting to assess this data.

b) Computer Engineering and Systems – Is currently the only accredited program at the Institute. The assessment program will need to be improved in preparation for the October 2016 visit. Dr. Raj Katti, the new program coordinator of the CES program will bring a wealth of assessment experience to the program in Summer 2014.

c) Information Technology and Systems – Has created a new system of embedded indicators to assess student learning. Data is being collected from each instructor and then progress is monitored on outcome worksheets (example enclosed). After this system is created, 1/3 of the indicators will be assessed each year. The hope is to have this system in place by June 2014.

d) Masters of Cybersecurity and Leadership – Will be partnering with the Milgard School of Business in the coming year for accreditation of the program. The faculty has met and revised the student learning outcomes based on our first year of operation.

2. **Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.**

Each program has a curriculum committee that meets monthly. Meetings are recorded in meeting minutes. The results of these meetings are summarized at the monthly Institute meetings, where all faculty are in attendance. The institution regularly reviews its assessment processes to assure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement. All Institute programs are experiencing rapid growth, which has resulted in numerous new hires and the expansion of electives. The challenge for the coming years is the preparation for the ABET visit and insuring all faculty actively participate in the assessment process.

3. **Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcomes did you address this year?**

New this year was series of discussion lead by Richard Wilkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Organizational Effectiveness and Development. Over the course of the past year, Richard led discussions at two retreats and three faculty meetings. Richard also met individually with faculty members to gauge the atmosphere of the Institute and what priorities should the Institute Leadership address.
a) It this primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research, or Service? It was all three, but mainly teaching. One major discussion area focused on our current system of teaching evaluation. The old system was deemed too adversarial, so a new system was created to be more collegial. A new form was created and the results of an observation now have become part of a faculty member’s self-assessment process.

Promotion and Tenure has always been a point of contention at the Institute. The process still needs improvement, but faculty discussions at the retreats and meetings has made the process smoother. Our mid-tenure process is now standardized and gives faculty members better direction in preparation for the tenure review process.

The faculty conducted an exercise to determine what does the Institute need? The top five needs were discussed, with the others recorded for future discussions.

Another outcome of these discussions was the ability for all faculty to participate in the strategic direction of the Institute. Currently the Institute is considering reorganization into a school, which will affect all aspects of teaching, research and service. Richard Wilkinson was an effective mentor in the process of promoting discussion as the Institute seeks its strategic direction.

b) What type of data did you collect to assess this goal to provide evidence for decision making?

We used small discussion groups of faculty members to exchange ideas, which were later presented to the entire faculty. We also invited a group of non-Institute faculty and outsiders for a roundtable discussion of what the Institute means to them. This was an effective method for the faculty to understand what needs to be considered in the Institute’s strategic planning.

c) Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to the analysis?

Richard Wilkinson provided information about what other organization were doing when confronted with the challenges we are facing. Chancellor Kenyon Chan and IAS faculty have provided depth to the question of the Institute becoming a school.

d) Document where there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported and analyzed by the faculty and suggestions made for program improvement as a result. These main subject areas have been part of the monthly program curriculum meetings as well as Institute level meetings. They are documented in meeting minutes and each level maintains an electronic log. This process is ongoing and will continue.

e) Document how you made the results available to appropriate constituencies.

None of these results have been made available to our constituents. In the future they will be reported to students via program websites, bi-annual meetings with Community College (CTC) representatives, and discussed at our quarterly advisory board meetings.

From the NWCCU Standards
1.B – Core Themes

1.B.1 The institution identifies core themes that individually manifest essential elements of its mission and collectively encompass its mission.

1.B.2 The institution establishes objectives for each of its core themes and identifies meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement that form the basis for evaluating accomplishment of the objectives of its core themes.

NOTE: The UW has chosen Teaching, Research, and Service as its core themes.

4.A – Assessment

4.A.1 The institution engages in ongoing systematic collection and analysis of meaningful, assessable, and verifiable data—quantitative and/or qualitative, as appropriate to its indicators of achievement—as the basis for evaluating the accomplishment of its core theme objectives.

4.A.2 The institution engages in an effective system of evaluation of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered, to evaluate achievement of clearly identified program goals or intended outcomes. Faculty have a primary role in the evaluation of educational programs and services.

4.A.3 The institution documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes.

4.A.4 The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of programs and services with respect to accomplishment of core theme objectives.

4.A.5 The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of planning, resources, capacity, practices, and assessment with respect to achievement of the goals or intended outcomes of its programs or services, wherever offered and however delivered.

4.A.6 The institution regularly reviews its assessment processes to ensure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.

4.B – Improvement

4.B.1 Results of core theme assessments and results of assessments of programs and services are: a) based on meaningful institutionally identified indicators of achievement; b) used for improvement by informing planning, decision making, and allocation of resources and capacity; and c) made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

4.B.2 The institution uses the results of its assessment of student learning to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices that lead to enhancement of student learning achievements. Results of student learning assessments are made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.
Librarians have been assessing various student learning goals in multiple classes over the course of the year. Methods have included classroom assessment where students complete a research-related activity or exercise during the Library instruction sessions and direct assessments where student work is collected and reviewed. Examples of assessment are included below.

Justin Wadland has been collaborating closely with faculty teaching TWRT 211 to ensure that library instruction is included in every section. In select TWRT 211 sessions, students completed an exercise to assess their understanding of peer-review. Next year, assessments will focus on the goal that students will use at least two different Library databases to search for articles.

In TARTS 407, Jennifer Sundheim is collaborating with Elizabeth Conner to review bibliographies from student research papers to identify gaps in their research and provide additional direction. These assessment results will also be used to improve student outcomes by revising the Library instruction session outcomes, content, and delivery.

In TBUS 310, Erica Coe collaborated with Evy Shankus to review group papers to determine what sources were used for the assignment. These assessment results were used to improve the online research guide to direct students to appropriate resources and to focus the learning outcomes of the Library instruction session.

In THIST 470, Suzanne Klinger has collaborated with Dr. Julie Nicoletta to ensure that students understand the differences between primary and secondary sources. If students do not correctly identify and use two primary and two secondary sources in their assignments, Dr. Nicoletta requires the students to meet with Suzanne individually. In TIAS 380, Suzanne worked with two sections of Humanities and Social Science Research to provide instructors with a pre-assessment of students’ experience and awareness of approaches to literature searching, citation identification, and scholarly research evaluation skills. As a result of individual consultations during the quarter with students on their chosen projects, Suzanne provided instructors with a summary of patterns of common misunderstandings and inadequate understanding of research skills.

The UW Libraries conducts a Triennial survey of undergraduates, graduates, and faculty that focuses on library use and satisfaction as well as user needs and library priorities. The faculty survey includes questions related to assessment of undergraduate performance, the library’s contributions to student learning, and satisfaction with instruction services. The student surveys include questions related to the Library’s contributions to their ability to find information needed for research assignments and papers and their satisfaction with research and instruction services. Librarians will be reviewing the 2013 results over the summer to identify areas of improvement and opportunities for collaboration with faculty. We will also discuss methods to share these results with campus constituencies.
RE:  AAC Reporting Requirements AY 2013-2014

Here are the responses that you have requested:

Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.

We have targeted three program competencies for review in terms of data collection, analysis and continuous improvement in student learning: Communication, Ethics, and Strategic Thinking. These competencies have been identified as target areas based on the results of course-embedded measures in core courses, as well as student exit survey data gathered in our program’s capstone course TBUS 400.

We have also implemented a review process of core courses to ensure consistency across multiple sections taught by different instructors. Instructors of these courses have met to review and discuss their respective syllabi and pedagogical approaches for consistency in five key areas: (1) program competencies supported by the course; (2) specific student learning objectives targeted in the course; (3) major content areas addressed in the course; (4) level of academic rigor in the course; and (5) assessment techniques used to measure student performance on core competencies and specific learning objectives.

Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.

In response to the data collected it has been determined that we are not effectively capturing “Ethics” as a consistent theme in our capstone course. Further, we have identified that we have not fully articulated a systematic approach to introduce ethics into the pedagogy of our lower level courses.

As a result, there is an on-going conversation regarding the best way to systematically define the competency in terms of outcomes and further to develop a comprehensive strategy which will effectively and consistently introduce and reinforce ethics as a competency. In the management concentration, ethics will be introduced in TBUS 300 (Managing Organizations) and reinforced in TBUS 310 (Effective Managerial Communication), as well as other elective courses in the management concentration. In the Marketing concentration, ethics will be covered in all sections of the core course TBUS 320 (Introduction to Marketing). In the accounting concentration, three classes have been identified where ethics would be focused on and measured: TACCT 303 (Intermediate accounting III), TACCT 411 (Auditing Standards and Principles) and TACCT 451 (Individual Income Taxation).

Additionally, the Management Faculty will begin using “Giving Voice to Values,” which is an innovative, cross-disciplinary business curriculum and action-oriented pedagogical approach for developing the skills, knowledge and commitment required to implement values-based leadership. This approach is based on the work of Mary Gentile and published by Yale University Press. It draws on actual business
experiences as well as social science research to offer advice, practical exercises, and scripts for handling a wide range of ethical dilemmas.

Document how you now have an annual cycle to:

Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcome(s) did you address this year?

This year we are continuing our focus on Teamwork and have also begun the work to focus on Ethics as our next SLO of focus moving forward.

Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research, or Service (UW accreditation themes, NWCCU Standard I.B.1, 1.B.2., 4.A.1

This is a teaching goal.

What type of data did you collect to assess this goal (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making.

Course embedded measures are used in the capstone course TBUS 400 (Business Policy and Strategic Management). Student responses to a case study that required analysis of an ethical concern in a business environment were evaluated and rated then reported back against a goal for attainment. This was done consistently in each section of the capstone course. Data from student exit surveys conducted in TBUS 400 were also used.

Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)?

No additional sources of data were used other than the data collected with the course embedded measures.

Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty, and suggestions made for program improvement as a result. 4.A.3, 4.B.1

Management Faculty met on April 18th to discuss planned improvements for the assessment and evaluation of the ethics competency, as well as ways to ensure consistency across multiple sections of the same course taught by different instructors. Faculty of the Marketing concentration met on April 17th, and faculty of the Accounting concentration met on April 24th to discuss the same.

Document how you made the results available to appropriate constituencies. (4.B. 1, 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students).

As part of an on-going cycle of accreditation requirements for AACSB, these results are made available in electronic format for all interested parties to view and to provide any necessary input.
1. **Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.**

Currently, the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) program has a robust system to measure student learning goals and therefore no new policies or procedures needed to be developed. For the BSN program, the ten goals that we desire the students to achieve by graduation are the ones that we use to measure Student Learning Goals. The specific measurement strategies are as follows:

a. We continue to monitor student grade point average to identify those students at risk for earning less than a 2.0. In these cases, a mid-course warning is issued with a specific plan to enhance student success.

b. We continue to monitor student evaluation of teaching effectiveness to identify where course/curriculum changes may be needed. Evaluations of less than a 4.0 are reviewed by the program director for possible changes in objectives or teaching strategies.

c. We continue to obtain information using surveys as a way to measure the Student Learning Goals as well as the critical outcomes related to influence as alumni in their healthcare organizations.

   i. End of Program (EPA) Survey (n=72) and Alumni Survey (n=21) for 2012-2013. Respondents reported satisfaction with the program. The scores were within the 4-5 range (with 5 being the best) and were consistent with prior years. Also, the comments were very positive, especially in terms of development of critical thinking, evidence-based practice, communications, diversity, health systems and policy, teamwork, leadership, and teamwork. Faculty commitment was also noted as a positive.

   ii. Specific EPA results. Over 1/3 of the BSN graduates were on a committee at work, on a committee of a professional organization, or on a committee within the community. Importantly, over 80% of the graduates reported that earning a BSN definitely motivated them to continue to stay in nursing, a finding consistent with the literature.

   iii. Specific Alumni results. Results show that almost 30% of the alumni completed some graduate courses and 52% plan to begin graduate study in the future.

2. **Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.**

a. This year, the BSN committee focused on assessing the adequacy of the curriculum as related to the Program/Student Learning Goals. Using data from EPAs and Alumni surveys and information the Essentials required by the American Association of Colleges in Nursing (AACN), the following curriculum actions were taken:
i. TNURS 340 – Clinical Nursing Phenomena modified to include an objective related to clinical reasoning. Assignments are being developed to support this new objective.

ii. TNURS 414 – Health, Communities and Populations added the word “environmental” to an objective for the Winter 2014 quarter.

iii. Six additional course syllabi were reviewed (402, 410, 412, 414, 435, and 451) to insure that objectives and content were consistent with the Student Learning Goals and AACN essentials.

b. A detailed review of the BSN writing courses was conducted to insure compliance with the University of Washington Tacoma (UWT) writing policy. Both TNURS 430 – Interpersonal Communication and TNURS 350 – Critical Analysis and Writing had assignments that addressed each of the five UWT writing policy requirements.

c. Faculty developed an Individual Student Practicum Evaluation (ISPE) for TNURS 414 – Health Communities and Population. This evaluation will provide specific feedback to students about their individual clinical performance. The students have been informed about this evaluation and associated rubric. Pilot testing of this evaluation is being conducted.

3. **Document how you now have an annual cycle to:**

a. Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcomes did you address this year?

The BSN program has ten Student Learning Outcomes which were adopted by faculty in the UW Tacoma Nursing and Healthcare Leadership program. During 2013-2014, two Student Learning Outcomes were used to evaluate the BSN curriculum to enhance knowledge acquisition expected in our BSN graduates. These two goals also guided the development of the Individual Student Practicum Evaluation. The two goals are as follows:

i. Demonstrate effective professional communication and collaboration to optimize health outcomes.

ii. Deliver and advocate for health promotion and disease prevention strategies at the individual, family, community and population levels.

b. Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research or Service (UW accreditation themes, NWCCU Standard 1.B.1., 1.B.2., 4.A.1.)

The above Student Learning Outcomes are primarily teaching outcomes.

c. What type of data did you collect to assess these goals (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making?

As described above, the BSN committee used student surveys and EPAs and the AACN Essentials to obtain information about the functioning of the curriculum to assess student achievement of the two learning outcomes. In addition, faculty evaluations were reviewed by the Program Director to identify areas where specific course and/or teaching strategies changes would enhance student learning. Finally, student progress in courses was monitored to insure that a plan was developed to assist students in attaining the program goals.

d. Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)?
Coordination of ways to enhance BSN Student Learning Outcomes was done in conjunction with the Healthcare Leadership committee to address the need to provide inter-professional education (IPE). The American Association of Colleges of Nursing reaffirmed having increased inter-professional education and practice as a goal which has the support of six health professional organizations [dentistry, medicine (2), nursing, pharmacy and public health]. In support of IPE, both the BSN committee and HCL committee re-affirmed to continue to have selected courses offered jointly to both the BSN and HCL students. Three courses will continue to have both types of students with plans to add content applicable to both groups (e.g., business ethics added to the ethics course and clinical effectiveness research added to the research course).

e. Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty and suggestions made for program improvement as a result (4.A.3., 4.B.1).

Data was initially reported and analyzed by the faculty during the BSN committee meetings. Then, changes in curriculum were discussed at the Nursing and Healthcare Leadership faculty meetings (3 Dec 2013, 11 Feb 2014, 11 Mar and 22 April 2014). Additionally, detailed minutes of all BSN committee meetings are available on the program’s shared drive.

f. Document how you made the result available to appropriate constituencies (4.b.1., 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students)

Current BSN students were informed of course changes by the student representative on the BSN committee and the advisor. Additionally, a Catalyst Survey was used to document that students received and read the new Individual Practicum Evaluation. An annual advisory meeting of community members is used to exchange information about the Nursing and Healthcare Leadership Program. Our director also meets with the deans/directors of other nursing programs located in Washington to address curriculum issues. She reports information from these meetings to the program faculty.
1. Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.

Currently, the Healthcare Leadership program has a robust system to measure student learning goals and therefore no new policies or procedures needed to be developed. For the HCL program, the five goals that we desire the students to achieve by graduation are the ones that we use to measure Student Learning Goals. The specific measurement strategies are as follows:

a. We continue to monitor student grade point average to identify those students at risk for earning less than a 2.0. In these cases, a mid-course warning is issued with a specific plan to enhance student success.

b. We continue to monitor student evaluation of teaching effectiveness to identify where course/curriculum changes may be needed. Evaluations of less than a 4.0 are reviewed by the program director for possible changes in objectives or teaching strategies.

c. We continue to obtain information using surveys as a way to measure the critical outcomes related to employment in healthcare after students graduate.

   i. Telephone survey of 2011, 2012, and 2013 graduates. Of the 61 graduates, 27 responded for a response rate of 44%. As a measure of student learning, 80% of the HCL graduates are employed full or part time in healthcare. Since graduation, 56% report an increase in income and 63% report an increase in responsibilities.

   ii. Email survey of 2012 graduates. A response rate of 42% was obtained (11/26). Of those who responded, 82% report employment in healthcare.

d. We continue to use information provided by the End-of-Program Assessment (EPA). These EPAs are completed by students in the last quarter of their senior year in their fieldwork course. They provide evidence of how they achieved each of the five Student Learning Goals. In 2013, information from the completed EPAs (n=28) provided specific information related to programmatic changes which will be described in Item #2. Of note in this section are findings which report that 74% of our students express a desire to obtain a graduate degree. Also important to measuring Student Learning Goals is to examine students’ perceptions of how well they met the HCL Student Learning Goals. For 2013, the overall mean rating increased to 4.19 as compared to a 3.42 rating from the 2012 graduates (higher being goals better met).

2. Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.

This year, the HCL committee focused on assessing the adequacy of the curriculum as related to the Program/Student Learning Goals. Using data from student surveys and EPAs as well as stakeholder information, the following changes were made to the curriculum:
a. THLEAD 350 – Critical Analysis and Writing (3 credits) was combined with THLEAD 450 – Initial Connected Learning (1 credit) to create a five-credit course.

b. THLEAD 405 – Health Informatics I and THLEAD 406 – Health Informatics II were developed to increase student’s data analytic abilities based on healthcare employment needs. TINST 311 – Data Management and Data Analysis will no longer be a required course as of Fall 2014.

c. THLEAD 310 – Health, Illness and Society was approved as a diversity course. TNURS 407 – Diversity, Health and Inequities will no longer be required due to redundancy with the content in THLEAD 310.

Overall the HCL major increased from a 55-credit major to a 58-credit major. In addition, 32 credits of electives will be required with 10 credits coming from upper division courses. Specific health-related electives will not be required, but students will be advised to take health- or business-related courses.

3. Document how you now have an annual cycle to:

a. Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcomes did you address this year?

The HCL program has five Student Learning Outcomes which were adopted by faculty in the UW Tacoma Nursing and Healthcare Leadership program. During 2013-2014, all five Student Learning Outcomes were used to modify the HCL curriculum to enhance knowledge acquisition expected in our HCL graduates. The five goals are as follows:

i. Use multiple communication strategies that enhance positive human relationships considering both healthcare clients/customers and workforce personnel.

ii. Demonstrate the ability to integrate both theoretical and experiential knowledge relevant to leadership in the healthcare environment.

iii. Integrate ethical behaviors into healthcare leadership practice.

iv. Demonstrate knowledge of the healthcare environment that includes synthesis of the cost, access, and quality challenges and the ability to generate solutions to these challenges.

v. Demonstrate basic budgeting, outcomes measurement, and information management.

b. Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research or Service (UW accreditation themes, NWCCU Standard 1.B.1., 1.B.2., 4.A.1.)

The above Student Learning Outcomes are primarily teaching outcomes.

c. What type of data did you collect to assess these goals (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making?

As described above, the HCL committee used student surveys and EPAs to obtain information about the functioning of the curriculum to assess student achievement of the five learning outcomes. In addition, faculty evaluations were reviewed by the Program Director to identify areas where specific course and/or teaching strategies changes would enhance student learning. Finally, student progress in courses was monitored with to insure that a plan was developed to assist students in attaining the program goals.
d. Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)?

Stakeholders provided information related to the need for health informatics courses to assist our students in achieving Learning Outcome V. In addition, coordination of ways to enhance HCL Student Learning Outcomes was done in conjunction with the BSN committee to address the need to provide inter-professional education (IPE). The American Association of Colleges of Nursing reaffirmed the goal of having increased inter-professional education and practice as a goal which has the support of six health professional organizations [dentistry, medicine (2), nursing, pharmacy and public health]. In support of IPE, both the HCL committee and BSN committee re-affirmed to continue to have selected courses offered jointly to both the HCL and BSN students. Three courses will continue to have both types of students with plans to add content applicable to both groups (e.g., business ethics added to the ethics course and clinical effectiveness research added to the research course).

e. Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty and suggestions made for program improvement as a result (4.A.3., 4.B.1).

Data was initially reported and analyzed by the faculty during the HCL committee meetings. Then, changes in curriculum were discussed at the Nursing and Healthcare Leadership faculty meetings. As needed, votes by the faculty approved curriculum and program changes (14 Jan 2014, 28 Jan 2014, 11 Mar 2014, and 8 April 2014). Prior to voting, faculty engaged in discussion of any desired changes. Significant course changes or new courses were submitted to Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee at UWT and then to the UWS Curriculum Committee.

f. Document how you made the result available to appropriate constituencies (4.b.1., 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students)

Current HCL students were informed of curriculum changes by the student representative on the HCL committee and the advisor. New curriculum will be available on the HCL website. Fieldwork preceptors were informed of changes.
1. **Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.**

Currently, the Master of Nursing (MN) program has a robust system to measure Student Learning Goals and therefore no new policies or procedures needed to be developed. For the MN program, the six goals that we desire the students to achieve by graduation are the ones that we use to measure Student Learning Goals. The specific measurement strategies are as follows:

a. We continue to monitor student grade point average to identify those students at risk for earning less than a 2.7 or having an overall grade point average of less than 3.0. In these cases, a mid-course warning is issued with a specific plan to enhance student success.

b. We continue to monitor student evaluation of teaching effectiveness to identify where course/curriculum changes may be needed. Evaluations of less than a 4.0 are reviewed by the program director for possible changes in objectives or teaching strategies.

c. We continue to obtain information using surveys as a way to measure the students learning goals as well as the critical outcomes related to alumni influence in their healthcare organizations.

   i. End of Program (EPA) Survey. About half of the graduates change jobs or roles due to completing their MN program. Of these, 16/17 indicated that they used the knowledge/skills from their curriculum option with similar findings for fieldwork. Graduating MNs indicated that they met all the program goals with scores of 4.4 or higher (with 5 being the highest).

   ii. Alumni Survey. Analysis of results showed no areas for improvements. The question related to leadership strategies will continued to be monitored as the new MN curriculum requires all students to take a leadership course as compared to only students in the leadership focus in the current curriculum.

2. **Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.**

   a. This year, the MN committee focused on creating a new MN curriculum that addressed the 10 Essentials required by the American Association of Colleges in Nursing (AACN). The AACN Essentials document provided specific data in the form of 10 essentials with their associated objectives that have to be included in the new MN curriculum. To implement this new MN curriculum by Fall 2014, the MN committee devoted very significant amounts of time and effort to accomplishing this task.
i. A total of seven courses were developed or significantly revised; an additional three courses are in the development process.

ii. In addition to the current education focus, a second focus of Leader in Health Care Delivery was created.

iii. The sequence of course offerings was developed.

iv. New marketing information was created.

3. **Document how you now have an annual cycle to:**
   a. Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcomes did you address this year?

   The MN program has six Student Learning Outcomes which were adopted by faculty in the UW Tacoma Nursing and Healthcare Leadership program. During 2013-2014, all six Student Learning Outcomes were used to insure that the new curriculum addressed all of these outcomes.

   i. Evaluate the adequacy of underlying knowledge from nursing science, related fields, and professional foundations as it informs nursing practice.

   ii. Competently assess, manage health-related issues with a defined population or care system, and evaluate the effectiveness of these nursing practices.

   iii. Utilize knowledge and skills in professional practice among diverse and multi-cultural populations.

   iv. Demonstrate competence in development of inquiry relevant to practice, education, or administration.

   v. Develop and utilize leadership strategies that foster improvement of healthcare.

   vi. Articulate ethical issues and responsibilities involved in nursing practice.

   b. Identify if this is primarily an outcome for Teaching, Research or Service (UW accreditation themes, NWCCU Standard 1.B.1., 1.B.2., 4.A.1.)

   The above Student Learning Outcomes are primarily teaching outcomes.

   c. What type of data did you collect to assess these goals (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making?

   As described above, the MN committee used student surveys and EPAs and the AACN Essentials to obtain information about the functioning of the curriculum to assess student achievement of the above goals. However, with the need to implement a new curriculum, the AACN Essentials were the main contributor to decision making. Consistent with past practices, faculty evaluations were reviewed by the Program Director to identify areas where specific course and/or teaching strategies changes would enhance student learning during this year of curriculum change. Finally, student progress in courses was monitored with to insure that a plan was developed to assist students in attaining the program goals.

   d. Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)?
Our director also meets with the deans/directors of other nursing programs located in Washington to address curriculum issues. She reports information from these meetings to the program faculty. We are working closely with the University of Washington Bothell Nursing Program faculty as both programs move forward to implement the new MN Essentials.

e. Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported, and analyzed by faculty and suggestions made for program improvement as a result (4.A.3., 4.B.1).

In addition to reviewing the surveys, faculty developed the new MN curriculum during the MN committee meetings. Then, the new MN curriculum with associated courses were discussed at the Nursing and Healthcare Leadership faculty meetings (8 Oct 2013, 19 Nov 2013, 3 Dec 2013, 14 Jan 2014, 28 Jan 2014, 25 Feb 2014, and 11 Apr 2014). As needed, votes by the faculty approved curriculum and courses. Significant course changes or new courses were submitted to Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee at UWT and then to the UWS Curriculum Committee. Additionally, detailed minutes of all MN committee meetings are available on the program’s shared drive.

f. Document how you made the result available to appropriate constituencies (4.b.1., 4.B.2) (e.g., advisory boards, students)

Current MN students were informed of course changes by the student representative on the MN committee and the advisor. An annual advisory meeting of community members is used to exchange information about the Nursing and Healthcare Leadership Program.
Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.

We focused on retention efforts this year instead of on one particular student learning goal. Included in this list are surveys as well as programs that we either instituted this academic year or are continuing from last academic year. Our chief assessment goal this year was to focus on the effectiveness of Core overall, with attention to the outcomes established for Core courses. Once we have analyzed this data, we will be in a better position to make alterations in the program’s goals.

- **Phone survey:** Beginning in February we began calling students who had completed their first year but did not register for classes Autumn 2013. We also called first year students who started at UWT fall of 2013 but did not register for courses Winter 2014. The survey also included students who transferred to UWT and left during or after their first year here. We are in the process of using alternative methods to contact the students we were unable to reach by phone to see if they will complete the survey.
- **First year student survey:** Both Core and non-Core, the goal of which was to understand the impact of Core on student learning. We will be giving this same survey to all first year students in a couple of weeks so that we can measure any changes to this information.
- **Students Learning Objective Outcomes survey of Core faculty:** This survey is given to faculty at the end of each quarter so that we can better assess student learning in the Core from the faculty’s perspective. It is collected, stored on the OUE Core website, and used to determine what changes, if any, should be made to the Core.
- **Make-up tests in OUE:** We hope this will have a great impact on student persistence. This new practice began in winter quarter.
- **OUE is working with Global Honors to establish a lower-division track.** Global Honors is a UWT upper-division, interdisciplinary honors program offering a rigorous global curriculum in a seminar format and immersive study abroad opportunities.
- **Undergraduate Research Symposium:** OUE plans to host a campus-wide undergraduate research symposium on an annual basis and to sponsor quarterly student showcases on campus.
- **Undergraduate Education Student Advisory Board:** OUE is developing a student advisory board to help us develop new and better ways of ensuring student success.
- **The Undergraduate Education Academic Council:** The UEAC oversees curriculum issues pertaining to undergraduate education at UWT and plays an important role in elevating the profile and quality of the undergraduate academic experience at UWT.
- **The Chancellor’s Undergraduate Research Scholar award** provides financial support for research which engages undergraduate students in meaningful research experiences with faculty and other undergraduate scholars. Nominations from faculty are accepted twice a year with an opportunity to renew awards quarterly.
• Launched a series of First Year Experience Activities: the purpose of these activities is to build community among first year students, as well as to gather anecdotal data about their experience. We will use that information to plan for future events.

• Enhanced the OUE profile on campus by opening Facebook, Twitter and Instagram accounts, as well as updated our website with new information about Core.

• OUE is in the process of partnering with Academic Advising on Registration Workshops throughout the summer

• OUE is also in the process of developing 2 credit seminars (first and second year)

Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected. We have made no programmatic changes because we are still in the process of gathering and assessing data.

Document how you now have an annual cycle to:

• Choose at least one focus from your Student Learning Outcomes. What outcome(s) did you address this year? We have begun an annual, academic year, cycle to gather data through phone surveys and surveys of all core students. This was our first year to go through this cycle.

• What type of data did you collect to assess this goal (using methods previously defined by the major) to provide evidence for decision making. We are still in process of analyzing the data from the phone survey and the first year survey.

• Were there other sources of data you used to add depth to analysis (e.g., campus-wide winter survey)? We have had discussions with core faculty, students, and the OUE Academic Council about methods of assessment, questions we should be asking, and given the stated learning objectives, what students are getting out of the Core. We are developing an assessment plan to review Core as it is currently structured. This plan will be submitted to Vice Chancellor JW Harrington at the end of June.

• Document when there was a meeting or meetings in which this data was reported and analyzed by faculty, and suggestions made for program improvement as a result. 4.A.3, 4.B.1

We are still in the process of analyzing this data. Once we have had a chance to look at the results of the data, we will be able to determine what changes need to be made and how and to whom the results will be made available to the appropriate constituencies.
Describe any new policies and procedures around your measurement of Student Learning Goals.

None at this time

Summarize your documented programmatic changes made in response to data collected.

Business student focus group:
-Updated front desk procedures/information to better welcome students

Winter student survey and Spring TLC survey:
-Results to be discussed at TLC staff meeting on 6/18/14

Student Learning Outcomes

TLC SLO’s to be discussed at 6/24/14 staff meeting

4a SLO addressed: Students will develop into Independent Learners.
  (results did not completely align)

4b Teaching

4c TLC Spring student survey

4d –

4e Survey to be discussed at 6/18/14; SLO’s at 6/24/14 staff meeting

4f To be determined