

TO: Academic Program & Standards Committee
FROM: Learning Outcomes Working Group¹
DATE: April 23, 2018
RE: Report of the All-College Graduation Requirements Assessment 2016-2018

Statement on Assessment

Dickinson College has established basic principles to assess student learning and to enhance structures supporting it. During the spring semester of 2013, a special “Provost’s Resource Group” of faculty that had been established to review our academic program at a time of presidential transition took up the question of assessment. The Group identified central principles, including particularly:

- *The primary purpose of assessment is to maintain/improve the high quality of the academic program*
- *The results of assessment should be useful*
- *The results of assessment must be coordinated with all-college committees to inform decision-making.*
- *Embedding assessment in current assignments/activities of courses/academic program should always be the first approach, not “adding on”*
- *The kind of specific support needed will vary across academic programs*
- *Assessment of student learning is a piece of institutional assessment.*²

Assessment Cycle

To meet these principles, we implemented a four-year assessment cycle: focus for two years on academic program assessment (years 1 and 2 of the cycle) and two years on all-college requirements assessment. This approach allows us to gather data in years 1 and 3 and to devote years 2 and 4 to the review and analysis of that data.

Academic Program Assessment

In 2014-2016 (years 1 and 2 of the current 4-year cycle) faculty focused on departmental/program assessment, identifying an issue that was important to student achievement in their programs. The Learning Outcomes Working Group (LOWG), a subcommittee of the Academic Program and Standards Committee (APSC) and Academic Affairs staff worked closely with faculty to help them identify appropriate means to gather data and consulted on the analysis of the results. The report of that cycle of assessment was presented to APSC by Senior Associate Provost John Henson.

¹ Terry Barber, Brenda Bretz, Angie Harris, John Henson, Mike Holden, Noreen Lape, Sarah McGaughey, Eleanor Mitchell, Jason Rivera

² <http://www.dickinson.edu/info/20027/academics/2985/assessment>

All-College Graduation Requirement Assessment

In 2016-2018 (years 3 and 4 of the current 4-year cycle), assessment efforts were devoted to the all-college requirements; LOWG again provided guidance. Academic affairs, institutional effectiveness and inclusivity, and institutional research staff provided administrative support for the assessment of the arts, humanities, lab science, language, quantitative reasoning, social science, and US diversity requirements. (NOTE: Assessment of the FYS, WiD, and Sustainability requirements occur under the leadership of Noreen Lape, Director of the FYS and Writing Program, and Neil Leary, Directory of CSE, respectively. Reports of those assessment activities occur separately.)

In Summer 2016 faculty working groups for arts, humanities, quantitative reasoning and social sciences met to develop student learning outcomes for the all-college graduation requirement. They consulted with those who routinely teach courses meeting the requirement and incorporated feedback in the final version of the student learning outcomes.

Several of the working groups also included guidance to faculty on what the definition of “met” should be for one or more of the learning outcomes. Faculty working groups for lab science, language, and US diversity requirements met to determine the approach faculty would take to gather data during 2016-17 academic year. Lab science and language working groups determined that faculty should choose which learning outcome to assess; US diversity working group identified a question to focus all assessment on one specific learning outcome. A reporting form unique to each graduation requirement was created for faculty use.

Gathering Data 2016-2017

Because approved student learning outcomes were in place, faculty teaching courses meeting the lab science, language, and US diversity graduation requirement were able to gather data in fall 2016:

- 17 lab science courses; 362 students
- 6 language courses; 62 students
- 15 US diversity courses; 371 students

Faculty approved the learning outcomes for the remaining graduation requirements in December 2016.³ Faculty teaching courses meeting the arts, humanities, lab science, language, quantitative reasoning, social science, and US diversity graduation requirements gathered data in spring 2017:

- 15 arts courses; 224 students
- 17 humanities courses; 396 students
- 23 lab science courses; 178 students
- 9 language courses; 114 students

³Learning outcomes for the global diversity requirement [previously named comparative civilizations] were approved midway through spring 2017, therefore data will be gathered on that requirement during the next all-college graduation assessment cycle in 2020-2021.
http://www.dickinson.edu/info/20061/academic_program_and_standards_committee/697/graduation_requirements

- 22 quantitative reasoning courses; 596 students
- 34 social science courses; 811 students
- 14 US diversity courses; 343 students

Procedure

Senior Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Brenda Bretz contacted the faculty teaching courses meeting the all-college graduation requirements prior to the semester in which they were teaching and reminded them that they would be gathering data. Faculty teaching more than one course were asked to identify the course in which they would gather data (faculty only had to gather data in one). Because of this approach, we do not have data for every course taught in 2016-17 that fulfills a graduation requirement. For example: if a course met the social science and the US diversity requirement, the faculty member could choose to conduct assessment focusing on the US diversity question; this course would not have data gathered about the social science learning outcomes.

FPC mandated that all faculty must participate in the college's assessment work. However, a small number of faculty did not gather data during the 2016-17 academic year. We acknowledge that the procedure for overseeing this assessment was cumbersome and consistent follow-up with faculty did not occur. Since most of the missing courses were taught by adjuncts, we have revised our procedures to be sure we provide appropriate follow up and support so that all faculty can contribute their responses and analysis.

Goals for this Assessment Cycle

This was our first opportunity to gather data and analyze the results for most of the graduation requirements, therefore, we were most interested in answering these questions:

- Do the approved student learning outcomes meet our expectations for these requirements?
- Are faculty able to gather information about students meeting the learning outcome in a way that is meaningful and manageable?
- Do have faculty have the support they need to gather appropriate information to assess the learning outcome?
- What do the results tell us?

Faculty again participated in working groups during 2017-18 academic year to review the reports for the requirements⁴. The key points from those conversations are below:

Observations:

- There were no instances where the faculty questioned the appropriateness of the learning outcomes to their course.
- Most faculty communicated the learning outcomes either on the syllabus or by discussing in class.
- Faculty used embedded assignments to conduct the assessment.

⁴ Thank you to the faculty who participated: Terry Barber, Ellen Gray, John Henson, Mike Holden, Emily Marshall, Sarah McGaughey, Toby Reiner, Steve Riccio, Sherry Ritchey, Jorge Sagastume, Melinda Schlitt, Todd Wronski, Megan Yost. The working group conversations were facilitated by Brenda Bretz, VP for Institutional Effectiveness and Inclusivity and Jason Rivera, Director of Institutional Research.

- Allowing faculty to determine the appropriate assignment rather than imposing a standard assessment tool works well and reinforces our approach that assessment should be meaningful and manageable and not an add on.
- Most reports show that all or most students were in the “met” category.
- The quality of the faculty comments about the assessment results is highly variable and, in some cases, simply restate the numeric results in narrative form without any context or analysis about them.

Recommendations:

- Faculty should share their thoughts on the results to ensure that the faculty member and LOWG/APSC have meaningful information about student learning with regard to the specific assessment exercise.
- Create an internal virtual teaching site – this would be value added, not to replace in-person faculty mentoring around teaching and could be especially beneficial for junior faculty. On this site, we could post examples of the following (along with the course syllabus)
 - o meaningful/manageable ways faculty gathered information to assess
 - o informative and interesting faculty analysis of the results
 - o how faculty may have used that information
 - o general best practices in course design and teaching approaches
- Revise the form (*Language Working Group rewrote the entire form, attached; Quantitative Reasoning Working Group suggested a change to the numeric reporting section*):
 - o Require that faculty attach the syllabus and the assignment used for the assessment
 - o Include the rubric for evaluating the work
 - o Ask at what point in semester
 - o Ask for their own analysis of what was learned from assessment before asking for numeric breakdown of “Met” or “Not Met” (do not make this optional)
 - o Continue with the “Met” “Not Met” and “Did Not Attempt” categories on the report, but for those who wish to do so, provide the option to subdivide the “Met” category into “Met” and “Partially Met”.
- Departments should have conversations about assessment results and how courses from their programs meeting graduation requirements fit within their majors, recommending that the conversation be framed around “best practices” at the departmental level. This is particularly relevant as the cycle of departmental/programmatic assessment will begin in fall 2018.
- Offer support to faculty to identify the most appropriate assignment
- Faculty should include SLOs for *all* requirements (all-college, departmental, and course) in the course syllabus. NOTE: We recognize that for courses meeting multiple requirements, the list of approved learning outcomes will overtake the syllabus. LOWG can assist faculty with “mapping” the graduation and/or program requirements to the specific course requirements to avoid a laundry list approach.
- Prior to the next all-college graduation requirement assessment cycle, *departments/programs* should work together to answer the following questions for the courses in their program that meet all-college graduation requirement(s):

- How do you design your course(s) to achieve the stated learning outcomes?
- How do disciplines engage the broader all-college learning outcomes?

We forward the following to APSC on behalf of the working groups. We do not have an opinion or recommendation; these are shared simply for APSC discussion and consideration.

- Several working groups raised concerns that courses meeting a graduation requirement are above the 100 level, and some of these courses have pre-requisites. Is this a concern? NOTE: This is appropriate for languages, obviously, and, may be appropriate for other courses as well. Example: A course that fulfills the quantitative reasoning requirement may actually be used to fulfill something else. Ex: ECON 111 can count as both a quantitative reasoning and social science requirement. If a student uses it for social science, they will be able to use an upper level ECON to fulfill the quantitative reasoning. The question that came up is: will that upper-level ECON course appropriately be able to meet the learning outcomes for the quantitative reasoning requirement? Does asking that faculty member to assess that course for the graduation requirement violate our “meaningful/manageable” criteria?
- Are there any concerns that a single course can qualify to fulfill a distribution requirement in more than one of the four fundamental branches of the academic curriculum? Example: A single PHIL/POSC course meets both humanities and social science requirements. The question here is about the viability of course content being able to do both – not about how a student is permitted to fulfill graduation requirements. See Bulletin language below about current policy.
 - *A single course may be used to fulfill a distribution requirement in only one of the four fundamental branches of the academic curriculum (the Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Laboratory Sciences).*
 - *A single course that fulfills a distribution requirement and another requirement may be used to fulfill each requirement, but counts as only one of the 32 required for graduation. The following exception applies: A course that fulfills both the laboratory science and quantitative reasoning (QR) may fulfill only one or the other.*
- When a course from another institution or AP credit is used to fulfill a requirement, must it meet the exact same student learning outcomes that we have established for our graduation requirements?
- Some faculty raised concern in their reports that all or most students had met the learning outcomes. Is there reason to be concerned if all or most students in a course fall into the “met” category?
 - Is the high level of courses having “met” the various requirements a byproduct of faculty feeling inadvertent pressure to “justify” their course and teaching because of concerns about the purpose of assessment?
 - Assessment is meant to help answer questions about student learning and teaching practices that help achieve student learning. Assessment is a tool for faculty growth and development by offering insights into course design from a student learning perspective.

- Assessment results are not meant to nor are assessment results ever used in the review of faculty for promotion or tenure. They are meant to offer a moment of reflection for faculty at large about their own courses and the interconnected nature of the curriculum as a whole.
- With relation to the interest in how departments design courses to achieve all-college graduation requirement learning outcomes, should APSC request departments to review the coding of various courses within departments to determine if it still makes sense to have some courses coded as they are?
 - Courses are coded as fulfilling various requirements at the time of creation/submission for approval by APSC
 - Changes to all-college graduation requirements, learning outcomes, professors in charge of the course, etc., may require departments to examine whether courses, as currently offered, meet the same coding criteria as when they were originally created
 - Does this suggest the need for a regular cycle of review for courses coded as meeting specific all-college graduation requirements to ensure accurate coding of courses over time?

The members of LOWG are available to meet with APSC to answer any questions or to engage in conversation about assessment activities.

APPENDIX A -- Detail from the working group conversations.

Arts Requirement:

Observations:

- Faculty were thoughtful about how to use the results from this assessment in future offerings of the course – “closing the loop.”
- Faculty commented on their reports that being more intentional about communicating the learning outcome to the students is beneficial as is incorporating some examples of successful work that demonstrates achievement and/or practicing throughout the semester.
- There was a great deal of variability in the level of the course identified as meeting the requirement. This made it more difficult to interpret the results.

Recommendations:

- Review the current list of courses that are coded as meeting the Arts requirement to ensure that they are correctly coded.
- Faculty seemed to choose an assignment that was easiest to “quantify” and may not have been the best assignment to determine whether a student met the learning outcome. We should provide support (perhaps via a workshop? Or via one-on-one conversation?) on how to use assignments that faculty may feel are difficult to quantify.
- Identify best practices of what faculty found and share on an internal site. This can be seen as a virtual teaching site – value added; not to replace in person faculty mentoring around teaching. Would also ask faculty to share syllabi.

Humanities Requirement:

Observations:

- Two faculty members seemed confused about the assessment and seem to have evaluated the WR aspect – but did not participate in the WiD assessment (which used a different data gathering technique -- faculty submit papers to Noreen Lape for review by a team),
- Some faculty expressed concern that 100% of their students were in the category of “met”.

Recommendations:

- Faculty might benefit from clarity about what is required in terms of the scope of the assessment. Perhaps whoever is in charge of the process could give more guidance. Some seemed to gather a lot of information; more than was necessary.
- Very important to have the learning outcomes on the syllabus and that the faculty re-articulate the learning outcome specific to the course/assignment (“map” the outcome).
- Revise the form:
 - o Include syllabus or ask them to include how they reworded the learning outcome in the course; in the assignment
 - o Include the rubric for evaluating the work
 - o Ask at what point in semester

- Ask their own analysis before asking for data. Use Nitsa's as an example and way to articulate the question.
- Need to understand how departments/programs are integrating the overall graduation requirement learning outcomes into their specific programs.
 - Suggested that we visit humanities departments and participate in a guided conversation about this.
 - Agenda for that conversation:
 - **Ask:** How does your discipline respond to these goals? Are they successful as articulated? What are the discipline-specific ways to engage with these goals? How has the attention to the graduation learning outcomes allowed departments to think about how they incorporate the humanities related aspects of their courses more intentionally in to the syllabus?
 - Share info from the Bulletin and SLO:

2. Distribution Courses: The challenges and opportunities facing our students require complex and sophisticated responses. Therefore, we require courses that introduce students to the special nature of inquiry in each of the four fundamental branches of the academic curriculum: the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and the laboratory sciences. *Normally, the expectation is that distribution courses will be completed by the end of the sophomore year.*

Humanities: Courses that fulfill the humanities requirement allow students to understand, explore, analyze and interpret the historical, cultural, and philosophical dimensions of human experience. This occurs through focused analysis of texts, narratives, rituals and/or other media as well as philosophical argumentation.

[APSC website] The Humanities explore and interpret human experiences and perceptions of the world primarily through textual and conceptual analysis of works of literature, religion, and philosophy. Upon completing the course, students will be able to (as approved by faculty December 2016):

- Recognize that distinctive form(s) of expression provide gateways into aspects of the human experience.
- Analyze how form(s) of expression respond to aspects of the human experience.
- Evaluate how form(s) of expression affect humanity in personal, national or global ways.
- Ask them to bring course syllabi for the discussion.
- Be prepared to share best practices from the assessment: faculty who were particularly thoughtful about how to think about the learning outcomes in the assignment.
- Share with the department the list from Banner of all courses coded as HUMN. Are there courses that fit not currently coded? Some that are coded and shouldn't be?

- At end of discussion, ask again: How does the discipline respond? Is the description and SLOs accurate reflection of the Humanities. Able to be mapped to program? Courses? Assignments?
- If time, ask if template is useful or not.

Lab Science Requirement:

Observations:

- Faculty used embedded assignments to conduct the assessment which indicates that the learning outcomes are integrated into the course content and learning goals.
- Where appropriate, faculty used established inventories (Physics used Force Concepts Inventory) or an external rubric (Chemistry used ACS standards).
- Faculty who included some thoughts about the results were thoughtful about what changes they might make to improve the student learning
- Some departments with multiple sections of the same course coordinated the assessment so that all faculty teaching that course assessed the same learning outcome in the same manner.

Recommendations:

- Require faculty to provide thoughts about the assessment results.
- Give more guidance on the question: “Provide your thoughts about these results.” Most reports included a narrative that simply repeated the numerical information in the chart. Ask specifically for how faculty might use the data/information discovered to think about improvements for course/department.
- CHEM 131 and 132 meets both lab science and quantitative reasoning. The department decided to assess the lab science learning outcomes for all 131 sections in the fall and the quantitative reasoning learning outcomes for all 132 sections in the spring. Might suggest to other departments with multiple sections of a course that they consider this approach.
- Suggest that departments have a conversation about these results in the spring prior to the next cycle. There was interest in framing this discussion around “best practices” at the department level.
- Most professional organizations within the science departments likely have a standard/rubric for their fields that might be useful to use for assessment. If departments think it appropriate, they could identify how the assessed learning outcome matches a specific goal of a relevant professional society and use the established rubric available.
- Should consider assessing multiple sections of the same course in the same manner irrespective of instructor.

Language Requirement:

Observations:

- Faculty used embedded assignments to conduct the assessment, confirming that the learning outcomes are integrated into the course content.
- Faculty identified course and pedagogically relevant approaches to gather the information.

- Allowing faculty to determine which assignment best works to assess the learning outcomes works well and should continue to be the approach taken.
- Faculty were intentional about communicating the learning outcomes by either including on the syllabus or discussing in class.
- Faculty were able to reword the learning outcome to be specific to the course and in some cases to be specific to the assignment.
- Faculty were thoughtful about how to use the results from this assessment in future offerings of the course – “closing the loop”, such as:
 - o Be more intentional about communicating the learning outcome to the students
 - o Share examples of successful work that demonstrates achievement
 - o Provide more opportunities for students to apply what they are learning throughout the semester
- Faculty confirmed that these learning outcomes appropriately represent what students should be able to do upon the completion of the intermediate language course.

Recommendations:

- Faculty need to be more intentional about including the learning outcomes on the syllabus.
- Some faculty indicated how difficult it was to meet the 1st learning outcome. Does that suggest faculty should review this one to see if it should be revised?
- Examine the language placement exams that some students can use to test out of the language requirement. In current form, the language placement exams focus solely on a linguistic ability dimension whereas the new language student learning outcomes focus on additional areas of cultural/intercultural context.
- Recommend changing the form specifically for assessing the language requirement to focus less on completing the task and more on the process that is occurring for student learning. (See draft new form below)

Language Requirement
Learning Outcomes Assessment
Template to Report Results

Languages: Global Citizens expand their own worldview through the understanding of others as well as through a grasp of the complex relationship between language and culture. In order to expand their horizons and reflect on their own worldview, students must obtain intermediate level skills, which will prepare them to be immersed in another language and culture. Students will be able to do the following at the intermediate level (as approved by faculty December 2015):

- engage purposefully with users of the target language;
Students will have met this when language accuracy exists to the extent that mistakes do not hamper successful communication with a native speaker accustomed to interacting with second language learners OR with interpretation of text in the target language
- participate in communities in the target language⁵ in a variety of contexts and in culturally appropriate ways;
Students will have met when they can successfully identify linguistic and cultural variation within a given language and culture
- use the language to explore the practices, products, and perspectives of another culture;
Students will have met when they demonstrate conscious awareness about a specific practice, product, or perspective of another culture using the target language, when appropriate
- view their own language and culture through the lens of another
Students will have met when they demonstrate conscious awareness of significant differences between their own and the target culture and language

NOTE: The phrase “demonstrate conscious awareness of significant differences” is borrowed from the Interagency Language Round Table’s (ILR) definition for skill level 2 for Cultural Competency.

PLEASE ATTACH YOUR SYLLABUS AND THE ASSIGNMENT YOU USED FOR THIS ASSESSMENT.

1. Choose one student’s work to attach to this report (does not have to be an example of the best). How does this one compare with the others in the class? NOTE: You may also

⁵ The working group suggests clarifying the second SLO by replacing “multilingual communities” with “communities in the target language”.

discuss an oral assignment, quiz, or exam. If so, please insert your notes and a copy of the assessment you provided to the student.

How many students fell into each of these categories:

Met		Partially Met		Did Not Meet		Did Not Attempt	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

2. Which outcome are you reflecting on with this assignment?
3. How does this assignment help you assess the outcome?
4. Why was this an effective measure of the outcome? What would you say to a colleague about how this was an effective assignment?
5. Even if you believe that your approach and this assignment was particularly effective to further student learning on this outcome, would you make any changes to it or to the overall course as a result of what you learned from this assessment? [We are compiling a library of effective practices; may we add your example to that library?]

Quantitative Reasoning Requirement:

Observations:

- Giving faculty the option to provide thoughts about the assessment is not recommended; the faculty member’s thoughts about the results is the most important aspect of the results and should be required.
- Faculty who included some thoughts about the results were thoughtful about what changes they might make to improve the student learning.

Recommendations:

- Rather than asking for the # and % of students meeting each category on the current reporting form, ask faculty to provide the distribution of the results and whether it is normal.
- Need to have a definition of “met.” There was a discussion about the broad array of courses that could meet the requirement and how “met” is incredibly contextual to both the course and assignment. Need faculty to describe what “met” means in their context.
- There should be a subcommittee of APSC to address some of the issues that are unique to the quantitative reasoning requirements:
 - o Confirm the courses that meet the requirement and coordinate with the QR Center so that there is support for students in the diverse kinds of courses that could meet the requirement. Currently, QR Center is only equipped to handle courses focused on numeracy.
 - o Determine if there should be a rubric for the quantitative reasoning requirement that would provide consistency across the various assignments.

- Should there be two different sets of learning outcomes -- one for numeracy courses and one for non-numeracy courses (ex: Logic, Music theory)?

Social Science Requirement:

Observations:

- No faculty mentioned any concern about the learning outcomes as they are articulated. One commented that it was difficult to separate the from one another in order to conduct a targeted assessment. This suggests that the learning outcomes are well connected, if not dependent on one another in order to properly achieve.
- Faculty used embedded assignments to conduct the assessment which indicates that the learning outcomes are integrated into the course content and learning goals.
- Faculty identified course and pedagogical relevant approaches to gather the information.
- Faculty were very intentional about communicating the learning outcomes by either including on the syllabus or discussing in class.
- The results are so obvious to the faculty members that they have not communicated their thinking about it in a way that is obvious to the reader of the reports.
- The quality of the faculty comments about the assessment results is highly variable.

Recommendations:

- Before next cycle of data gathering, pull together a study group of all faculty teaching a Social Science course that year. They can share thoughts about how to assess and coordinate which outcome they will assess.

US Diversity Requirement:

Observations:

- Focusing on a single question seemed to raise the faculty member's attention to the learning outcome. The reports were very detailed and contained information about what they learned.
- Faculty were thoughtful about how to use the results from this assessment in future offerings of the course – “closing the loop.”

Recommendations:

- Review the 5th learning outcome – seems to fit well with the new initiative on civic engagement and may be better addressed in other ways.
- Consideration about WHICH courses should be identified as meeting the requirement. (Ex: Psych is not historical, is this OK?)
- Faculty who included some thoughts about the results were thoughtful about what changes they might make so that more students would be able to meet the expectation. However, many faculty did not answer the question, “Please include any details that the faculty working group (meeting 2017-18) who will analyze these results might find useful as they analyze the data (e.g., demographics of the students by graduation year, previous coursework the students might have had, where the assignment fits in with the sequence of other assignments, etc).” If student

demographics and previous coursework are important, they should be asked about more formally (and not using “e.g.” which seems to have led some faculty to consider this information optional).

- The assignments to answer the question did not confirm that intersectionality present (2 or more). Is that necessarily a concern? Possible that the course is handling intersectionality but the specific assignment to answer this question did not necessarily need to address this issue.

Appendix B --- Example Reports showing meaningful analysis

Assessment of ARTH 206
as part of the on-going assessment of the Arts Requirement Learnings Outcomes
Assessment
Course: ARTH 206
Instructor: P. Earenfight

Required Learning Outcome Objective considered in this assessment:

“develop an informed aesthetic awareness through analysis and/or experience.”

Preface

Much of the visual arts are site specific; to experience them, one must be in the same physical space as the material in question. For some types of material—e.g. urban planning, architecture, public sculpture—the viewer encounters it on a daily basis, often in a passive, unknowing, way. However, a large number of experiences with the visual arts take place in formal settings created explicitly for such an aesthetic experience, most notably, the museum. As a setting in which to experience the visual arts, the museum is a highly particular a mediating device that shapes and predicates one experience. The museum environment not only presents objects of the visual arts, it selects, orders, and presents them (known as curatorial practice) that to a large degree, dictates how one experiences the visual arts but (through labels, didactic text panels, interactive educational devices, and live educational programming), determines the narrative for the experience, what types of questions to consider, and what to think about it. Thus, understanding how the museum shapes our experience of the visual arts, enables the viewer to separate the environment from the object. Central to this issue is recognizing that the museum environment is itself the product of a creative process (architects, interior designers, curators), one that is designed to complement the appearance of objects on display, many of which were probably never intended for such an artificial construction.

An objective of the museum studies course, as stated in the course syllabus is—to *critically assess a museum exhibition*—within this context is to make visible the process and the people and the institution that shapes and mediates such experiences.

A. Course Materials Selected to support this objective:

Readings:

Carol Duncan and Alan Wallach, “The Universal Survey Museum”
Thomas Hoving, “Harlem on My Mind” from *Making the Mummies Dance*
Interview with Fred Wilson, “Mining the Museum”
Victoria Newhouse, *Towards a New Museum* (selections)

Films:

Art of The Steal (The Barnes Foundation, Philadelphia)
Entartete Kunst (Degenerate Art, Munich)
For the Living (Holocaust Museum, WDC)

Downside Up (MassMOCA)
Frank Lloyd Wright (Guggenheim, NYC)
Guggenheim Bilbao (Frank Ghery)
Concert of Wills (Richard Meier, Getty Museum, LA)
Steven Holl: Nelson Atkins Museum (Kansas City)
Herzog and de Meuron: Tate Modern (London)

This selection of material provides an extraordinary range of museum types, and focuses extensively on interviews with the architects who explain in considerable detail how their approach to design, materials, light, and form provide a particular context within which to experience the visual arts. Particularly interesting (and wildly entertaining) is watching Richard Meier argue at length and impassionededly with virtually everyone he can find on matters of museum aesthetics, including the curators, the director, the boards of trustees, the landscape architect, the interior designers, the stone masons, the museum café manager, the camera man, and the museum’s neighbors. This range of material, which is considered through the “Exhibitions” section of the course, provides students with a strong introduction to exhibition and museum design and how it shapes one’s experience of the visual arts.

- B. Student achievement in reaching this outcome was assessed through a series of three written reviews (each 4 pages, double-spaced) on exhibitions hosted by The Trout Gallery. They were:
 - i. Jose Guadalupe Posada and the Mexican Penny Press
 - ii. A British Sentiment: Landscape Drawing and Watercolors 1750-1950
 - iii. Kathe Kollwitz: Peasant War

- C. This objective is communicated on the syllabus, discussed in class, and printed on the assignment.

- D. How many students fell into each of these categories:

Student Learning Outcome (indicate in the blank space below the outcome you assessed)	Met		Did Not Meet		Did Not Attempt	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
	17	85	0	0	3	15

- E. My thoughts about these results.
 - a. The “met/did not meet” designation does not fully tell the story. 3 students did an extraordinary job—they really grasped the concept and the impact of architectural space and curatorial design on the objects one experiences; another 10 did a reasonably good job, grasping the essentials; and the 4 recognized the issues, but did not probe as deeply into the matter. 3 withdrew from the course (due to poor

- performance and the exams, prior to this assignment), accounting for the “did not respond category.”
- b. As an exercise, this is most useful. It leads students to consider all aspects of the museum’s architecture, the curator’s concept, and the exhibition’s designer’s ability to reinforce the exhibition concept visually. Students were expected to respond to the exhibition designer’s color palette, graphic design, curatorial flow, font choice, and relationship to the printed materials and (where available) web site/app design and what impact this has on what one sees. This is an essential skill, because it enables the viewer to separate the “stage” from the “actors” and how they interact. It also asks students to reflect on other ways to present the exhibitions.
 - c. Whether this assignment, and by extension, this course, fulfills the arts graduation requirement is debatable. Foremost, the course is designed to prepare students interested in a career in the museum/non-profit sector. It is part institutional history, part non-profit organizational study, part architectural/design assessment, part law-school legal case studies, part educational theory, part community engagement.

DeBlasio ENG 329 PHIL 270 RUSS 270

The Humanities explore and interpret human experiences and perceptions of the world primarily through textual and conceptual analysis of works of literature, religion, and philosophy. Upon completing the course, students will be able to (as approved by faculty December 2016):

- Recognize that distinctive form(s) of expression provide gateways into aspects of the human experience.
 - *Students will have met this outcome when they perceive, for example, that a poem, a philosophical argument, or a religious ritual provide different information about human experiences by virtue of their different forms as well as their different contents.*

- **Analyze how form(s) of expression respond to aspects of the human experience.**

- Evaluate how form(s) of expression affect humanity in personal, national or global ways.

1. What type of student work did you collect to determine the extent to which your students are achieving this outcome?

Writing assignment – 1 pg. paper, single spaced, 12 pt. font, 1” margins

Details on the assignment from my syllabus:

Essays (45%)

You will be required to write three short essays during the semester, each worth 15% of your grade. Each essay must be one single-spaced page (in 12-pt font with 1 inch margins), not including the Works Cited. This is an assignment in clear argumentation and “no-filler” (no plot summary) writing. The main goals of this kind of writing assignment are: (1) to identify and explain an argument as concisely as possible; and (2) to make strong use of evidence from a primary text without relying on plot summary. Superior essays will not just do an excellent job describing and explaining an argument from a primary text, but they will add something new to that argument in their interpretation and analysis. I will distribute prompts one week in advance of each deadline.

2. How did you communicate the learning outcomes to the students?

Printed on syllabus, discussed in class, and distributed on each prompt sheet for every essay (also posted on Moodle)

3. How many students fell into each of these categories:

Student Learning Outcome (indicate in the blank space below the outcome you assessed)	Met		Did Not Meet		Did Not Attempt	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
	21	100	0	0	0	0

4. If you did NOT use the one provided above, please provide your definition of “Met” and “Did Not Meet”
5. Please provide your thoughts about these results.

I based my assessment on all three short essays that my students wrote over the course of the semester. After writing the first essay, for instance, 3 students did not meet the learning outcome expectations and several others I would classify as having barely met them. However, we had two other essays in this same genre later in the semester; a large part of the reason why I schedule three similar essays (on different prompts) over the course of the semester is to help the students hone their writing and analysis in this one specific genre of writing. This kind of repeated practice in focused and concise writing allows me to help all students get to the point where they are meeting the learning goal by the end of the course. I also allow students the option of one rewrite during the semester; of the 3 students who did not meet the expectations on the first essay, two rewrote their essays and were able to meet the expectations the second time around. Of all 21 students in my course, over half chose to rewrite during the spring 2017 semester. It may be unusual for all students in a course to meet the learning goal. However, I try to set up this course in a way that all students, so long as they are working hard, will inevitably get to the point of meeting the course expectations, even if they weren't there at the beginning. For some it happens more quickly; for others it may only happen after 3 essays and a rewrite. I feel confident that the course adequately addressed the learning goal (highlighted at the beginning of this document) and that all students in my course met the course expectations. It also did not hurt that I had an especially motivated and strong group this semester.

**Assessment Results – Graduation Requirements – INBM110 SPRING 2017 – QR
Joy Middaugh**

Learning Outcome Selected: “Students fulfilling the QR requirement will be able to use quantitative methods to support an argument.”

Assignment used to assess learning outcome: Financial Accounting Project

The primary reasons for the project were as follows: to demonstrate the ability to apply financial analytical methods (financial ratios/ horizontal and vertical analysis) to financial statements using Excel; to specifically analyze the performance of a specific company; and, finally to better understand how operational decisions are reflected in financial statement results. Based on the financial analysis and on the company's stated future plans within their competitive markets students must indicate whether they would invest in the company or not and why.

Students must submit an excel file containing five worksheets. In addition, students must submit a 5-6 page written paper.

The learning outcomes for this assignment were communicated to students via a printed assignment as well as discussed in class.

Outcomes measured included the following:

Data Sheet (Excel portion)	Ratios Correct
Hort B/S(Excel portion)	Correct change and % formulas
Hort I/S (Excel portion)	Correct change and % formulas
Vert B/S (Excel portion)	Correct formulas & %
Vert I/S (Excel portion)	Correct formulas & %
Written portion	Does the paper clearly back an opinion based on ratios calculated using at least 4 ratios?
Written portion	Does the paper clearly back an opinion based on vertical & horizontal analysis using at least 4 comparisons?
Written portion	Based on the analysis, does the paper clearly state if the students feel they should invest in the company or not and why?

Social Sciences Requirement
 Learning Outcomes Assessment
 Template to Report Results
Rauhut PSYC 110

Social Sciences seek to explore and interpret social components of the human experience through observation and analysis of structures, institutions, and individuals. Students completing a course in the social sciences will begin to (as approved by faculty December 2016):

- Recognize how social and/or cultural processes shape human experiences.
- Analyze social and/or cultural components of human experiences.
- Interpret examples of social and/or cultural components of human experiences.

6. What type of student work did you collect to determine the extent to which your students are achieving this outcome?

Course Title: *Psychology 110: Animal Learning and Cognition*

Learning Goal Assessed: *Recognize how social and/or cultural processes shape human experiences.*

Students were asked to select a scholarly article and write a 1-2 page article summary. The focus on the paper was to describe how a behavior modification technique (e.g., positive reinforcement) is used to change a maladaptive human behavior (e.g., nail biting).

7. How did you communicate the learning outcomes to the students?

The writing assignment was included in the course syllabus. A handout also was distributed during the semester to more fully describe the goal of the writing assignment, how the writing assessment would be assessed, and the due date of the assignment.

8. How many students fell into each of these categories:

Student Learning Outcome (indicate in the blank space below the outcome you assessed)	Met		Did Not Meet		Did Not Attempt	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
	25	83.3	4	13.3	1	3.3

9. Please provide your thoughts about these results.

The following is the criterion that defined the 3 categories:

Met = a student receiving > 70% on the writing assignment

Did Not Meet = a student receiving below a 70 on the writing assignment

Did Not Attempt = a student that did not complete the assignment

While the overwhelming majority of students (~83%) completely met the goal, a few did not (~13%). When evaluating the papers of the students that failed to meet the goal, it seemed that students failed to meet the goal for one of two reasons. Either a student selected an article that was *not* appropriate for the assignment or a student selected an appropriate article but failed to focus on how the behavior modification program is an application of a learning principle. In the future, I plan to give more examples of the appropriate types of articles and where these articles can be located, perhaps identifying an *actual* article and explaining why this article is appropriate and what to focus on in the article when writing the paper.