

**PEER REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT (2019)
Findings and Summative Evaluation**

**Erin W. Stone and Claudia J. Stanny
January, 2020**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Peer Review of Assessment is an annual institution-wide discussion and reflection on the quality of program-level assessments of student learning outcomes. The 2019 Peer Review of Assessment included 45 participants, representing 28 academic departments, who engaged in facilitated discussions of program-level assessment of student learning in either undergraduate programs (3 groups), graduate programs (2 groups), or certificates and stand-alone minors (1 group). Scribes recorded notes at each of the table discussions.

A major structural change in 2019 was the elimination of facilitated discussions for General Education. This year representatives from General Education (GE) programs met separately for facilitated discussions of assessment findings for the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) identified for each of the General Education distribution areas (composition, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and arts and humanities). Discussions during the new General Education Making Sense meetings (held on October 25, 2019) focused on effective teaching around GE SLOs, informed by evidence of strengths and weaknesses observed in embedded assessments. The discussions during the Making Sense meetings are documented in a separate report.

This report presents details about the implementation of the 2019 Peer Review, summaries of the scribes' notes recorded for each department, an updated list of lessons for good assessment practices (compiled from multiple reviews), findings from the post-event evaluation of Peer Review, and recommendations to improve future Peer Reviews of Assessment.

Improving Assessment Reporting

An emerging theme from discussions during the 2018 review reinforces comments from past reviews, including formal reviews of assessment reports by trained reviewers: Telling a department's "assessment story" is a continuing challenge. Specifically, many departments continue to discuss their assessments of student learning in terms of the domain name for student learning outcomes (SLOs) as presented in an Academic Learning Compact (ALC) or Academic Learning Plan (ALP). Assessment reports and faculty discussions consistently reference domain names (Content, Communication, Critical Thinking, Integrity/Values) instead of clearly identifying the specific SLO assessed. Some discussions documented in the 2018 review did report the full SLO (in part because the Qualtrics survey used for reporting provides the full SLOs in a pull-down menu), but many participants and assessment reports continue to focus on the domain name.

This changed in 2019 reporting. Only four departments listed their SLOs using the domain name. Nearly all instead gave specific descriptions of student learning objectives. This is a huge improvement and shows growth in assessment across UWF.

Improving Peer Review of Assessment

Because participation in the 2018 post-review facilitated discussions of specific assessment topics was limited, and those who did participate reported on the evaluation that these discussions were not helpful, we decided to forgo facilitating discussions of assessment topics in 2019. Instead we limited the meeting activities to facilitated table discussions. By focusing on table discussions, departments had more time to discuss their assessments and challenges/successes with student learning. Participants seemed pleased at the simplified format.

Helping departments “tell their assessment story” continues to be a challenge. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has explored alternative reporting formats to attempt to improve the quality of information reported and eliminate aspects of past reports that encouraged redundant and sometimes cryptic reports. CUTLA and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will provide workshops to inform faculty about how to write an assessment report that will communicate effectively to external audiences as well as provide sound documentation of the department’s assessment work.

The location for the event this year, the same as in 2018, was (again) not ideal. Participants complained of room noise and excessive cross-talk between tables in a too-small room. We attempted to address this problem by reserving the UWF Conference Center in July 2019 for the October meeting, but the reservation was not honored (an excuse of “overbooking” was offered) and we lost access to the room late in the fall. We had to scramble to find alternative space and hoped eliminating the General Education tables might eliminate the noise issues experienced in this room in 2018. We plan to explore alternative spaces for 2020 that we can reserve with confidence that our reservation will be honored.

As in 2018, we held a pre-event training for facilitators and scribes. The meeting helped to prepare new scribes and facilitators (we recruited several new individuals in an effort to involve all colleges) and gave veterans the chance to share helpful advice. As in prior years we encouraged departments to send representatives who are sufficiently informed about the assessment process to contribute to a meaningful discussion of effective assessment and use of findings. We encourage departments that want to involve new faculty with Peer Review to bring these individuals as observers, which provides the professional development new faculty need to engage meaningfully during future Peer Review discussions. Most departments followed the instructions; several sent two or three representatives for professional development for junior faculty. Only a few representatives seemed unprepared.

Top Lessons for Good Assessment (Updated 2019)

1. Use a clearly worded rubric to assess specific SLOs. If rubric elements align with specific SLOs, track and report scores on rubric elements separately. Each rubric element serves as a discrete assessment for each SLO. Aggregated scores work as a student grade but blur information from multiple SLOs.

2. When possible, use an existing assignment that clearly aligns with the SLO as a direct measure. Students take graded assignments more seriously than “optional” assessment tasks and are more likely to submit their best work. The right kind of assignment is key for successful assessment.
3. Use the grading process (not grades) to generate assessment evidence. Existing assignments can provide meaningful assessment evidence if sub-scores (e.g., rubric elements) or selected components of the assignment (e.g., scores on a subset of exam questions) generate the assessment data instead of the global score that determines the grade for the assignment. While *grades* as such are not acceptable as assessment data (they are comprised of too many elements), the *grading process* can generate meaningful assessment data faculty disaggregate the multiple elements and report these as separate assessments.
4. Capstone courses typically include suitable assignments for embedded assessments, often for multiple SLOs. They are most effective when assessment occurs at multiple points in the curriculum, culminating with the capstone course. However, departments frequently learn useful information about student learning by assessing an SLO at an earlier point in the program. For example, if student writing in capstone projects is disappointing, an assessment of writing skill in an earlier course could identify where students are stumbling and suggest changes that will improve student writing sooner.
5. Written assignments often provide information about multiple SLOs, especially if the department constructs a rubric to evaluate the work. Individual rubric elements (or sets of elements) should align with individual SLOs. Report findings on rubric elements separately.
6. The best assessment processes emerge when an entire department cooperates and supports assessment. In particular, retreats and meetings to plan for assessment across courses and programs produce the best assessment practices. Assessment should be a continuous process. To facilitate an effective assessment cycle it may serve departments best to collect data in the fall so it can be analyzed and discussed at a meeting or retreat in the spring or early summer
7. A complete cycle of assessment entails reflection and action, not just reporting findings. Rather than simply describe and document assessment data collected, departments should reflect on and discuss how to use the findings to guide decisions that might improve overall program quality and student learning. For example, if an assessment shows a low rate of students who “meet expectations,” consider how program modifications might improve future performance. Does this topic/skill require more attention during class sessions? Do students need multiple opportunities (e.g., offered in several classes) to develop this skill? When changes are made, follow-up assessments will inform the department about whether these changes created the intended impact.

8. More assessment (as in more courses or more SLOs) assessed may not always be beneficial. More focused assessments may create more targeted and helpful data. Make it simple, make it meaningful, use the findings, and document the full process.
9. Curriculum maps can serve as program-level assessments of the coherence of the curriculum, answering questions such as: *Do students have enough opportunities to practice skills associated with a program-level SLO? Do courses include useful assignments that could be used to assess the SLOs the courses support?*
10. Surveys and exit interviews (indirect measures) are useful sources of information that help departments understand patterns observed in direct measures of learning (e.g., performance on a written paper). However, indirect measures are *supplements* and are not adequate as the sole assessment of an SLO.
11. Assessment is most effective when the findings can be used to guide decisions about *curriculum* and *instructional strategies*. Although decisions to improve assessment processes and measures are an appropriate use of assessment findings, avoid the temptation to endlessly refine measures. Imperfect findings can be “good enough” to guide preliminary decisions.
12. Tell your assessment story in language that will be understood by external reviewers. Shorthand references to SLOs may be understood in departmental discussions but might not be understood by reviewers outside the department or external to UWF. Assessment reports are often quoted verbatim in materials created for external reviews (Board of Governors, accrediting bodies). Assessment reports written with these audiences in mind should avoid internal jargon and provide complete descriptions of SLOs, assessment methods, and use of findings to inform efforts to improve student learning.

INTRODUCTION TO PEER REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT (2019)

The 2019 Peer Review of Assessment represents the ninth iteration of an institution-wide discussion and reflection on the quality of assessment of program-level student learning outcomes at the University of West Florida. A total of 29 departments were invited to participate; one department was not able to send representatives for various reasons (illness, prior commitments, etc.). Five departments, who were due to discuss General Education programs, were allowed to skip this year. Instead they attended a separate Gen Ed only Making Sense meeting on October 25, 2019. We will continue to allow programs whose circulation for the year is Gen Ed to attend only one assessment meeting. In addition, departments with only one curriculum to assess (graduate or undergraduate for example) will attend every other year since they have been discussing the same data. This gives departments a break to innovate and make changes from assessment in between meetings.

As with previous Peer Reviews, each department participated in a group comprised of representatives from 3-5 other departments. The groups met for a facilitated discussion. Scribes documented the ensuing discussion, including identification of the student learning outcomes assessed, the direct and indirect measures used for program-level assessment, and reflection on

how the department used assessment findings to identify strategies for improving the assessment process and/or improving the quality of future student learning.

The departments were separated into six tables. This year we had three tables dedicated to discussion of undergraduate program assessment, two to graduate program assessment, and one to the assessment of certificates and stand-alone minors. Each table had a facilitator and a scribe. A total of 45 individuals participated in the Peer Review (coordinators, facilitators, scribes, and department representatives). Stone and Angela Bryan (Director of IE) moved between tables to observe the process and provide assistance when needed.

The Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CUTLA) evaluated the Peer Review process through a post-event debriefing featuring discussion with facilitators and scribes and a post-event survey of participants (distributed in November and early December). Findings indicate strong levels of satisfaction among participating faculty. Open-ended responses on the survey and observations gathered from facilitators during the debriefing session identify areas for improvement of future peer review events. A summary of the formal evaluation based on the online survey appears at the end of this report.

Due to the conflicting events, and a cancellation, we once again held Peer Review in a large classroom in Building 70. Although the room appeared spacious enough for the smaller number of discussions this year, acoustics continued to be a problem (as they were in 2018). Future Peer Review meetings must be held in a different location.

We again had a sign in sheet for representatives that also identified their table number and both scribes and facilitators were provided with conversation/question guides or outlines to help keep discussions on track. This year, we eliminated general assessment discussions and limited the event to facilitated table discussions. Participants from each group could then leave when they finished their discussion. Participants seemed pleased with the simplicity, and based upon the discussion notes, conversations were productive.

As with last year, we asked representatives to review the data on the meeting website and to particularly take note of the additional documentation (required by ASPIRE) uploaded by each department (a quiz, survey, assignment, etc.) (versus asking participants to score reports with a rubric). We hoped this change would focus the discussions on student learning instead of assessment procedures and collection of data.

During our post-review/CASL meeting on November 20, we discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the Peer Review event. As in previous years, Peer Review was well attended and attendees reported it to be helpful for the departments and the development or improvement of assessment strategies. The survey and post-meeting debriefing is discussed at the end of the report.

STRATEGIES FOR EACH DEPARTMENT

Certificates and Stand Alone Minors

English

SLOs assessed: For the Certificate in Public, Technical, and Workplace Writing the department assessed two SLOs: (1) Present information using appropriate digital tools and (2) Design communication strategies that link audience and a text's message

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: To assess student's ability to present information using appropriate digital students had to create a digital portfolio for a specific audience. The portfolio was then assessed using a rubric. The department assessed student's success at designing communication strategies linked to a specific audience they submitted a proposal that was likewise scored on a rubric.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description SLO 1: Both F2F and online courses were included

Summary of findings: F2F students were stronger in this skill than online students, but since there were only two students in the F2F section, the results may be skewed. F2F – 100% (2 out of 2); Online – 76% (13 out of 17)

Sample description SLO 2: This SLO was included with a course that was offered online only.

Summary of findings: 88% of the students (90 out of 102) met the expectation

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: They will continue to look for ways to more seamlessly integrate the digital portfolio into our classes, including developing a library and/or tutorials that focus on digital portfolio platforms. They also plan to incorporate elements that require students to identify the audience and purpose of the text as well as the rhetorical techniques into the student plans to address a specific audience.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work):

The analysis of the e-portfolios show that students struggle a great deal with using the tool to highlight the skills they have learned in class. The instructors feel they need to spend more time with the students to help them learn how to use this tool to highlight their skills and less time on focusing on the logistics of creating an e-portfolio. They plan to explore ways to incorporate tutorials and/or videos that focus on the nuts-and-bolts of creating a digital portfolio so that more class time can be spent on developing the content itself.

Students struggle with identifying and speaking to specific audiences which is a key element of persuasive writing. While students did well on this SLO, the instructors plan to incorporate more exercises that ask students to identify and speak to specific audiences in hopes that the final projects more clearly address those readers.

Global Hospitality and Tourism Management

Capstone Course – Strategic Leadership and Hospitality Management

SLOs assessed: The department chose two SLOS. The first measured students' ability to select and defend an appropriate ethical and legal course of action and the second assessed students' success creating and delivering professional oral presentations

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: The goal was that at least 70% of students would be able to apply the concepts of laws and ethics in HFT3221 by reflection on current laws and how they affect the workforce. Assessment was measured through reflection. For the second SLO, the department wanted at least 75% of students to meet or exceed the standards using QEP Oral Communications rubric.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: 29 F2F students assessed for Integrity/Values and 15 students assessed for Communication

Summary of findings: 22 students (76%) met benchmark for SLO 1 and 80% met benchmark for SLO 2

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: The results showed that students could reflect on what they learned in the ethics section of HR and apply it to real life. The department now plans to improve and deepen how the students apply what they have learned about the laws to organizations. Looking at the data, they will use it to discuss how to incorporate more communication exercises into different classes. They will use the COB communications lab for feedback.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): Real world organization – Enterprise. Develop a business plan – strategic

For this particular project, because its focus has been on analyzing businesses that are already doing well (Enterprise, for example), the faculty may want look at organizations that are struggling to provide a stronger challenge and more real-world application for the students.

Students struggle with interpreting data and coming out with strategic position. The faculty feel that these skills need to be developed more throughout the program. They would like to work on developing skills in finance and accounting in more of the introductory courses so that nuances of these skills can be developed in more advanced courses.

History Department: Historic Preservation

SLOs assessed: Evaluate and apply general content knowledge on a professional level concerning method and theory in Historic Preservation.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: At least 70% of students complete a research paper regarding historic preservation using primary and secondary sources. Students will be assessed by a rubric tied to the research paper. Students will demonstrate advanced critical thinking through the effective application of historical and archaeological research and methodology.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: Sample size of 2 students, both F2F for both SLOs

Summary of findings: 100% met expectations for content, but only 50% met expectations for method/applying sources effectively in the paper

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Students met or exceeded expectations in being able to identify sources, create an argument, and complete a research paper. One student, however, was much more adept, than the other student, although both were able to meet expectations. One student struggled to use and apply appropriate source for research. The student failed to provide an appropriate number of primary sources and to apply the sources effectively in the research paper.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): This course will be replaced with a Capstone. In that manner, faculty will be able to capture skills of historical preservation at a culminating point. Because there is some challenge in students being able to conduct strong research, the faculty plan to incorporate research into every course and focus heavily on research in two methods classes. They are also exploring using a similar rubric for research for both undergraduate and graduate students to see how students are progressing in their research skills.

Military Science: Undergraduate Minor

SLOs assessed: Demonstrate troop leading procedures to accomplish squad operations. Apply the Operations Orders Process and demonstrate knowledge of Platoon Tactical Operations

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment:

Benchmark: 100% evaluated as 'Proficient' or better during Cadet Advanced Training

Benchmark: 100% evaluated as 'Proficient' or better during Cadet Advanced Training

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used.

Sample description: 15 F2F students

Summary of findings: 100% met benchmark

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Results indicate effective student learning

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work).

Military Science was unable to participate in the discussion. Form lacked any real or discussion of results. Not enough information to have a conversation.

Psychology Department: Human Resources

SLOs assessed: Describe how HR initiatives can be used to cope with workplace changes such as a more diverse workforce, globalization, and work-life balance

Direct measure(s) (indirect optional) used for assessment: At least 70% of students should demonstrate success (pass rate at 70%) on comprehensive multiple-choice questions test devised by program faculty. They are considering adding a student satisfaction measure by assessing students every four years or so following graduation to determine the impact of the certificate.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: 26 F2F students were assessed.

Summary of findings: 88% of the students met the benchmark

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Students graduating with certificate background did extremely well on the comprehensive exam. The department suspects their learning could be strengthened if they can encourage involvement in SHRM, the professional group that would promote HR identity formation.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): Faculty are feeling a disconnect between the class content and the SLOs, and that disconnect affects how the content is shared with the students. They would like to focus their attention on the type of ideas and concepts that are repeated throughout courses (for example, how people interact with each other). They want to have more conversations that show even if other classes do not speak directly to workplace SLOs, the skills learned in these other classes can be applied to the SLOs. .

Undergraduate Programs

Anthropology

SLOs assessed: Anthropology assessed student learning outcomes in the domains of Project Management, Problem Solving, and Critical Thinking, for two programs: Maritime Studies and Anthropology. The SLOs included 1. Describe and apply concepts and theories in the subfields of Anthropology or Maritime Studies 2. Use anthropological or maritime studies terminology correctly 3. Describe career options that follow training in archaeology or maritime studies 4. Define problems from an archaeological or maritime studies perspective 5. Identify relevant goals and objectives 6. Employ appropriate analytical tools 7. Draw reasonable conclusions 8. Communicate professionally about anthropology or maritime studies in writing and public speaking 9. Conduct research using information technology 10. Identify and practice ethical standards consistent with relevant professional organizations 11. Recognize ethical components in complex situations 12. Analyze complex ethical situations and design appropriate solutions 13. Articulate responsibilities of anthropologists to society 14. Design and execute projects reasonably with given time constraints 15. Develop backup planning skills 16. Collaborate effectively with team members

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: All the SLOs were assessed in upper level courses, either the Field School or an Internship/Capstone. The department assesses the Field School course on how well a student performs duties over the summer. A notebook is kept by the student during the field school and the notebook is turned in. The internship courses have an internship rubric. The internship students are responsible for sending the internship rubric to the sponsor. A project management assessment is used for the field school.

The department also conducts preliminary assessment in a course required for all tracks: Principles of Archeology. The course is available both face-to-face and online. Students in Principles of Archeology are assessed on problem-solving/critical thinking. At the lower

division, students must also take Introduction to Anthropology. Project management is assessed in Intro to Anthropology.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: The seriation exercise was administered to two sections of ANT 3101 (Principles of Archaeology), one live and one online. The seriation exercise illustrates how artifact/technology patterns change over time. Using data in the provided chart, students have to answer 20 questions to show that they can analyze the data and understand the principle of seriation. The benchmark was for at least 70% of the class pass the assignment with an 80% or above. In the live class, 79% of the students passed the benchmark, and in the online class 87% passed. One potential reason for the discrepancy may lie in the fact that the initial use of the exercise occurred in the face-to-face course in Fall, 2018, and in my second use of the instrument in the online class in Spring 2019 I was more familiar with the exercise, had seen where students had confusion and could address these issues better in the second application of the exercise. I anticipate that scores will get even better the next time I use this exercise. In the future, I may change the particular technology/artifact patterning being used to illustrate this concept.

Dr. Bratten also mentioned that Dr. Greg Cook is using a seriation assessment for data set plots which require students to utilize critical thinking skills to solve a given problem. The seriation technique can be used on multiple topics from dating pottery to dating record albums.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Dr. Bratten stated that the department will not use project management as an assessment next year. He also discussed the difficulties of managing four tracks, and after reviewing other anthropology departments, he found that none of the other departments track like UWF Anthropology. In another effort to simplify assessment the department recently revamped their curriculum and went from 20 SLOs to 7-8.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): A common discussion among the group was reducing the number of SLOs.

Art

SLOs Assessed:

- 1) Art History, BA: Recognize historic styles, their sequence, and the cultural forces that shaped them.
- 2) Studio Art, BA: Recognize historic styles, their sequences, and the cultural forces that shaped them and apply these to art historical discourse and/or studio practice.

Direct measure(s) (indirect optional) used for assessment:

- 1) Art History, BA: In ARH 4911 Research in Art History, faculty assessed using a research paper focused on using art historical sources and knowledge to support an argument and demonstrate awareness of historic styles, their sequence, and the cultural forces that

shaped them. Students received a rubric detailing the types of work organized by grade range, e.g. 97-100 A+ demonstrates exemplary work, and so on.

- 2) Studio Art, BA: After researching historical ceramic forms and their composition, students created a ceramic work and justified ways in which historical knowledge informed the work through a presentation component. Students were scored according to a rubric from Poor to Excellent in the areas of Craftsmanship; Sketchbook/Presentation; and Class Participation.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description:

- 1) Art History, BA
 - a. The department assessed two students in one face-to-face section of ARH 4911 and both met or exceeded expectations.
- 2) Studio Art, BA
 - a. The department assessed eight students in one face-to-face section and seven students (or 88%) met or exceeded expectations.

Summary of findings:

- 1) Art History, BA
 - a. Students succeeded in learning the relevance of art historical styles to personal research. However, a more rigid timeline could help students develop the necessary information.
- 2) Studio Art, BA
 - a. Students succeeded in this exercise.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement:

- 1) Art History, BA
 - a. Faculty are considering a more scaffolded assignment in that students would complete an annotated bibliography prior to completing their research paper.
- 2) Studio Art, BA
 - a. Consideration of applying this approach to the group at large in terms of discussion and critique by other students.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work):

The Studio Art program will maintain current method of assessment and compare data next year as they need more information. The regular Art History program is looking to move to an earlier assessment in the curriculum so students have the opportunity to improve. The table discussed the pluses and minuses of assessing via Capstone. First capstone only measures students who actually finish, and if they made it to the end they are likely to meet or exceed expectations. Second, what to do if they make it to the capstone and do not meet expectations? There is no other opportunity to improve at that point.

The Art department also wants to create Assessment Retreats in either late Spring or early Summer before faculty leave for summer. Theatre encouraged the all-encompassing assessment retreat while Math does five assessment meetings throughout the year instead of a retreat.

Finally the table discussed challenges with program assessment, including reducing SLOs, making SLOs uniform across their five specializations, creating five-year assessment plans, and how to test assessment tools. They are considering trying out portfolios and pilot testing them in a Portfolio gateway class (zero credit) in the BFA program. There Sophomores would develop portfolios to be critiqued before going into upper-level classes. This way student work in exhibitions can be assessed at multiple points in the curriculum. Eventually they may want to use the portfolio as a “cornerstone” type course.

Biology

SLOs assessed: Biology assessed multiple SLOs. 1. Identify and use the concepts, principles, and theories that constitute the core of the biological sciences 2. Apply scientific method to solve problems in the biological sciences. 3. Use language in oral and written form effectively and professionally 4. Describe ethical challenges involved in conducting scientific research with animals.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: Currently, Biology is using a pre and post-test assessment. At the lower level, students take Biology 1. In Biology 1, a comprehensive pre-test is given. At the upper level, students take the senior Biology Seminar, where the students take the post-test.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: Fourteen students were assessed for both SLOs 1 and 2. 71% of students met the benchmark for SLO 1 and 79% met for SLO 2.

Summary of findings: The results of the assessment exam were reviewed by the faculty during the assessment portion of the Spring 2019 Biology retreat with 15 of 19 Biology Department faculty in attendance. At the time, faculty requested and have subsequently received detailed information as to student success on questions relating to their program of student. Faculty will use these results to spotlight and address potential areas of deficiencies in courses within the program of study.

Dr. Cavnar stated that Biology found that there is only a 10% increase in students’ test scores from freshman to senior year. Dr. Cavnar stated that the results are not a reflection of what students learn. Instead, he suggested that the results are because the pre and post-tests are not tied to grades. Instructors found that most students finished the post-test in 10 minutes.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Because of the results of the pre and post-test, Biology has decided to get rid of the pre/post-test and start over this year with a different assessment strategy using the same SLOs.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work): One of the goals for Biology is to make assessment manageable. One option is to use more generic single SLOs. Biology is also looking at a multiple-year strategy. Dr. Cavnar stated that the Biology faculty meet every year at a retreat and give feedback on the current assessment

strategy. The faculty also provide suggestions and discuss assessment strategies for the next year.

Advice from the group included, do not try to do everything yourself and include faculty. Utilize a standard form to collect assessment data. Faculty get to know the expectations when you use a standard form and include them in the process.

Clinical-Laboratory-Sciences

SLOs assessed: Recognize and apply concepts, principles, and theories from the sciences that underlie clinical lab skills (e.g., biochemistry, pathophysiology); Distinguish abnormal from normal results; Conduct research using appropriate literature; Communicate effectively with related medical professionals and service providers.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: To assess student learning the department used National ASCP registry board exam scores, a capstone project/rubric, and a final CLS program evaluation.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: All areas scored above the 70% threshold for satisfactory. Half of students had to completely redo drafts.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: The department emphasized the importance of knowing the reference ranges and making sure reporting out the references ranges. It was essential. They also studied what exactly they were assessing and how much they were reinforcing. The department may now assess through smaller assignments that will be more authentic assessments. One faculty member did not assess or attend the faculty meeting to discuss assessment findings.

Accreditation focuses on student's ability to communicate with professionals. To assess they may study if students are professional during research and/or work at the hospital. To prepare students in 2017 they had a workshop that improved professional communication.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): The table had a robust discussion regarding the placement of the assessment, and if the capstone rubric was really assessing what was needed. Meaning, the students had the opportunity to go back and to fix what was wrong in the draft. Does this really assess? One suggestion was to have the student's supervisor do the assessment. Since many of these students are non-traditional, it could be a better way to assess the learning happening at the location.

Computer-Engineering-BSCE assessment

SLOs assessed: 1. Identify, analyze, and employ algorithmic concepts, principles, and theories in the design, implementation, and evaluation of computing systems. 2. Employ computing strategies to analyze and solve problems. 3. Create and deliver effective oral presentations and written reports with appropriate tools and technologies. 4. Describe ethical issues and responsibilities that relate to a computing professional.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: The department assesses the four SLOs with a variety of assignments including: final reports in the capstone course, initial and final presentations/reports in EGN4950 and EGN 4952L, Career Service assignments which

included mock job interviews, resume writing etc., library assignments, project notebooks, and final reports in EGN 4950 and EGN 4952L, final reports and team evaluations in EGN4950 and EGN4952L, and a 4 page essay report.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: Results were included in our ABET self-study report. During our fall 2018 ABET visit, the evaluators examined the supporting material and a summary of the assessment results and they were satisfied with what they saw. Outcome assessment are on a 3-year cycle.

All areas saw 100% satisfactory results except for communication, which was 93%. This was well above the 70% goal.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: ABET SLOs are in line for the next 6 years. Peer assessment was discussed, use Google Docs for tracking.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): The department has learned their lesson, of putting too many assessments into one class. To simplify assessment they will take out the capstone. They also want to do earlier assessments to be able to catch mistakes earlier in the program. They want to impact the students throughout the program and get more people involved in assessment.

The table discussed individual vs group work, and most favored individual assignments as they are better able to identify and evaluate individual contributions. Coding when reporting assessment is also easier to do for each student instead of trying to pull it out for groups.

They are also crossing 3 sections with the same assessment piece: an exam. Good suggestion is to control the delivery of the instrument, such as give to all classes on one specific day.

Criminal Justice

SLOs assessed: Criminal justice assessed six SLOs. 1. Outline the various structures and processes of the American Justice System 2. Identify and discuss the rules, laws, procedures, and policies which are the basis of the American Justice System 3. Identify and describe the roles and responsibilities of the various participants in the American Justice System 4. Define criminology and discuss its role in society 5. Identify and describe the major types of crime that occur in the United States 6. Identify the basic terms, concepts, and techniques used in criminal justice research and explain the research process.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: For the undergraduate courses, Criminal Justice assesses content in six required courses. A five-question quiz is given to the students in five of the six courses. Every faculty member is responsible for entering their student data into a Google Doc, then the data is tabulated. Each course has its own quiz. The sixth course is a capstone or seminar course, which is writing intensive so a quiz is not used in that course.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: SLO 1: 3 F2F sections of 103 students with 77% meeting the benchmark, 3 online sections of 101 students with 82% meeting benchmark; SLO 2: 3 F2F sections of 225 students with 84% meeting benchmark, 3 online sections of 241 students with 81% meeting; SLO 3: 2 F2F sections of 61 students with 95% meeting benchmark, 2 online sections of 70 students with 99% meeting; SLO 4: 1 F2F section of 140 students with 76%

meeting benchmark, 1 online section of 124 students with 73% meeting; SLO 5: 1 F2F section of 35 students with 74% meeting benchmark, 1 online section of 31 students with only 39% meeting benchmark.

Summary of findings: For the first three SLOs, in all modalities, the students passed the benchmark for success. The content, assignments, evaluation strategies, and the course material will be reviewed, and updated as deemed necessary in the relevant courses, such as CJL 3510, CJC 4010, and CCJ 3024, especially for the face-to-face offerings. In addition, one of the core courses, CCJ 3024, was recently redesigned as a writing-intensive course and the faculty have been discussing the ways to improve instructional strategies success.

For SLO 4, the students slightly passed the benchmark score for this SLO in all modalities. The faculty teaching CCJ 3014 and CCJ 3024 as well as other relevant elective courses, such as CCJ 3666, CCJ 3678, and similar others will review and revise course materials and teaching strategies as needed.

While the face to face students slightly exceeded the benchmark score in SLO 5, the online students scored below the benchmark. The faculty teaching CCJ 3014, CCJ 4700, and CCJ 3024 as well as other relevant elective courses, such as CCJ 4026, CCJ 2002, and similar others will review and revise course materials and teaching strategies, especially for online delivery, as needed. Drs. Hoffman and Goulette mentioned that a faculty member left during the semester and did not finish collecting the data for SLO 6. This may have skewed results.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Criminal Justice has 22 SLOs for the undergraduate program, but the assessment committee intends on cutting the SLOs down to 5 or 6 after consulting with the curriculum committee.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): The group discussed that the need to cut the number of SLO's was a common feeling among departments.

Electrical and Computer Engineering

SLOs assessed: Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering each seven SLOs that are verbatim from ABET accreditation standards. Courses are offered in Pensacola and Fort Walton Beach and thus data has to be collected/assessed for both campuses.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: The ECE department uses a variety of direct and indirect measures for outcome assessment. This includes sample student work from a select group of required courses, capstone projects, exit interviews, feedback from supervisors of internships and co-ops, and direct feedback from an Engineering Advisory Council composed of representatives from local employers.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: ABET requires that all outcomes should be evaluated on a 3-year cycle. Everyone is included in the process and the work is distributed among ten ECE faculty. For each outcome, the department assigns two or three faculty members to collect data and assess that outcome. Data is usually collected in the fall semester and the analysis is presented by the committee to the rest of the faculty in the spring semester. In addition, both Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering, require a Capstone project course where students are

required to fill out an exit interview. Parts of the exit interview are related to outcome assessment. The faculty also meet after the capstone courses are complete and discuss the quality of the projects. In addition, the ECE department meets with industry leaders once a year for feedback. The department utilizes a standardized form that asks what was evaluated, how it was evaluated, and whether or not the outcome is met.

Summary of findings: Both the Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering programs navigated a successful accreditation visit during the 2018-2019 AY. The ABET evaluators were satisfied with our assessment methods and the results we reported and reaffirmed our ABET accreditation for six years, the maximum period they can grant.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: The department is satisfied with their assessment procedures and results at this point.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): Dr. Khabou stated that in his experience the best thing to do in outcome assessment is to keep the process simple, meaningful, and standardized. Have performance indicators for outcomes and attach them to key classes that are required. Dr. Khabou also stated that it is important to consider when the SLO is met. For instance, is the SLO met when 80% of the students in the class must have C or better?

Health Sciences and Administration

SLOs Assessed:

- 1) Health Sciences, BS
 - a. Identify and apply the concepts, principles, and theories that constitute the health sciences.
 - b. Apply appropriate methods to solve problems in the health sciences.
 - c. Employ effective and professional communication in the health sciences.
- 2) Healthcare Administration, BS
 - a. Identify the characteristics and foundations of the healthcare administration discipline.
 - b. Apply critical problem solving and strategic thinking in analyzing and evaluating issues in healthcare administration.
 - c. Employ effective and professional communication in the healthcare administration discipline.
- 3) Public Health/Health Sciences, BS
 - a. Identify the characteristics and foundations of the public health discipline.
 - b. Apply critical problem solving in analyzing and evaluating issues in public health.
 - c. Employ effective and professional communication in the public health discipline.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment:

- 1) Health Sciences, BS
 - a. Objective-based final exam
 - b. Medical literature analysis, research study design, and written grant proposal (Capstone project) evaluated with a rubric

- c. Capstone project with emphasis on effective and professional communication evaluated with a rubric
- 2) Healthcare Administration, BS
 - a. Objective-based final exam
 - b. Medical literature analysis, research study design, and written grant proposal (Capstone project) evaluated with a rubric
 - c. Capstone project with emphasis on effective and professional communication evaluated with a rubric
- 3) Public Health/Health Sciences, BS
 - a. Objective-based final exam
 - b. Medical literature analysis, research study design, and written grant proposal (Capstone project) evaluated with a rubric
 - c. Capstone project with emphasis on effective and professional communication evaluated with a rubric

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description:

- 1) Health Sciences, BS
 - a. Sixteen online sections evaluated using a final exam. A total of 375 students out of 463 met or exceeded expectations (= 81% satisfactory). Faculty examined each exam and each question in more detail. Individual questions where students perform below expectations are reviewed.
 - b. Results from two online sections are reported. A total of 14 students out of 15 met or exceeded expectations (=93% satisfactory). Grant Proposal Project required students to work together as a team and compile an annotated bibliography of the current primary literature on a pressing and developing area of research in the healthcare field. From this information they individually develop ideas relating to health care delivery and future changes. Literature reviews are created and each student develops an idea for a research question and writes the idea into a grant proposal.
 - c. Results from two online sections are reported. A total of 13 students out of 14 met or exceeded expectations (=93% satisfactory). Grant Proposal Project required students to work together as a team and compile an annotated bibliography of the current primary literature on a pressing and developing area of research in the healthcare field. From this information they individually develop ideas relating to health care delivery and future changes. Literature reviews are created and each student develops an idea for a research question and writes the idea into a grant proposal.
- 2) Healthcare Administration, BS
 - a. Twelve online sections evaluated using a final exam. A total of 270 students out of 329 met or exceeded expectations (=82% satisfactory). Faculty examined each

exam and each question in more detail. Individual questions where students perform below expectations are reviewed.

- b. Results from two online sections are reported. All 22 students assessed met or exceeded expectations (=100% satisfactory). Grant Proposal Project required students to work together as a team and compile an annotated bibliography of the current primary literature on a pressing and developing area of research in the healthcare field. From this information they individually develop ideas relating to health care delivery and future changes. Literature reviews are created and each student develops an idea for a research question and writes the idea into a grant proposal.
 - c. Results from two online sections are reported. A total of 23 students out of 24 met or exceeded expectations (=96% satisfactory). Grant Proposal Project required students to work together as a team and compile an annotated bibliography of the current primary literature on a pressing and developing area of research in the healthcare field. From this information they individually develop ideas relating to health care delivery and future changes. Literature reviews are created and each student develops an idea for a research question and writes the idea into a grant proposal.
- 3) Public Health/Health Sciences, BS
- a. Ten online sections evaluated using a final exam. A total of 227 students out of 276 met or exceeded expectations (=82% satisfactory). Faculty examined each exam and each question in more detail. Individual questions where students perform below expectations are reviewed.
 - b. Results from two online sections are reported. All 9 students assessed met or exceeded expectations (=100% satisfactory). Grant Proposal Project required students to work together as a team and compile an annotated bibliography of the current primary literature on a pressing and developing area of research in the healthcare field. From this information they individually develop ideas relating to health care delivery and future changes. Literature reviews are created and each student develops an idea for a research question and writes the idea into a grant proposal.
 - c. Results from two online sections are reported. All 8 students assessed met or exceeded expectations (=100% satisfactory). Grant Proposal Project required students to work together as a team and compile an annotated bibliography of the current primary literature on a pressing and developing area of research in the healthcare field. From this information they individually develop ideas relating to health care delivery and future changes. Literature reviews are created and each student develops an idea for a research question and writes the idea into a grant proposal.

Summary of findings:

1) Health Sciences, BS

- a. Students met the benchmark for this assessment, however faculty felt that there was room to improve. Each exam was reviewed and areas where faculty felt improvement was needed were more closely evaluated.
 - b. Students continue to meet the benchmark for this assessment.
 - c. Students continue to meet the benchmark for this assessment.
- 2) Healthcare Administration, BS
- a. Although students met the benchmark, faculty reviewed each exam, identified areas for improvement, and evaluated those areas more closely.
 - b. Students continue to meet the benchmark for this assessment.
 - c. Students continue to meet the benchmark for this assessment.
- 3) Public Health/Health Sciences, BS
- a. Students met the benchmark for this assessment, however faculty felt that there was room to improve. Each exam was reviewed and areas where faculty felt improvement was needed were more closely evaluated.
 - b. Students continue to meet the benchmark for this assessment.
 - c. Students continue to meet the benchmark for this assessment.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement:

- 1) Health Sciences, BS
- a. HSC4050 Health Sciences Capstone, HSA4192 Health Informatics, GEY001 Gerontology, and BUL4602 Legal Fundamentals will augment their existing content and required material to improve scores on specific questions.
 - b. Faculty are generally pleased with the outcomes for this assessment and choose to continue to monitor the SLO using this tool.
 - c. Faculty are generally pleased with the outcomes for this assessment and choose to continue to monitor the SLO using this tool.
- 2) Healthcare Administration, BS
- a. HSC4050 Health Sciences Capstone, HSA3170 Principles of Healthcare Finance, HSA4192 Health Informatics, HSA4430 Health Economics, GEY001 Gerontology, BUL4602 Legal Fundamentals, and HSA4340 Quality Improvement will augment their existing content and required material to improve scores on specific questions.
 - b. After reviewing the course description, SLOs, and topics, faculty decided that a new capstone should be adopted for the Healthcare Administration specialization. A Program CCR will be submitted in September 2019 to implement this change.
 - c. After reviewing the course description, SLOs, and topics, faculty decided that a new capstone should be adopted for the Healthcare Administration specialization. A Program CCR will be submitted in September 2019 to implement this change.
- 3) Public Health/Health Sciences, BS
- a. HSC4050 Health Sciences Capstone and BUL4602 Legal Fundamentals will augment their existing content and required material to improve scores on specific questions.

- b. Faculty are generally pleased with the outcomes for this assessment and choose to continue to monitor the SLO using this tool.
- c. Faculty are generally pleased with the outcomes for this assessment and choose to continue to monitor the SLO using this tool.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work):

The department has worked to revise assessment methods over time and they are now much more sophisticated. Now, the department would like to assess new areas, which will focus on other topics and skills faculty have identified as areas of weakness. For example, Critical Thinking and Communication. Assessment instrument for critical thinking and communication, a capstone, has been in use for a while across three specializations. At the end of the semester, the chair disaggregates the data by courses then groups those by specialization to get assessment data by specialization. To assess, they developed a rubric based on QEP and VALUE rubrics to fit programs that is built into Canvas and used to grade student work. They then used the rubric data to show what topics and skills need additional focus in classes. Students are doing well consistently, so it is now time to change what to assess.

The department is also struggling to decide how to assess Content. Mathematics suggested that they use an objective exam to assess disciplinary content. The group then discussed important things to consider when using exam questions as assessment tools including: is the question good and if students are missing it how can the faculty improve instruction in the specific area.

Finally, the table addressed transfer students. How should they be assessed? One thought was to develop a cornerstone and capstone to assess at entry and just before they exit the program. They would assess both classes each semester.

Marketing

SLOs assessed: 1. Develop facility in the use of terminology and concepts in the major areas of business: Information Technology, Management, Accounting, Marketing, Economics, Finance.
2. Create, develop, and evaluate theory-drive, data-based, and ethical marketing strategy appropriate for a given environment

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Marketing faculty met on Friday, January 25, 2019 and approved a new set of SLOs put into place this year. They are the following: 1. Define marketing and discuss what it entails; 2. Describe and discuss how environmental factors affect marketing activities; 3. Describe factors involved in consumer decision-making; 4. Segment markets and develop the profile of a target market; 5. Explain product, distribution, promotion, and pricing strategies; 6. Apply marketing knowledge to analyze, evaluate and develop marketing strategies and tactics based on “real-world” situations.

They will also use a new tool for assessment, the MAR 3023 Marketing Assessment Instrument – Developed in July 2019. They will assess all students every semester in MAR 3023 Marketing Fundamentals and once yearly in MAR 4803 Marketing Strategy using an 18 multiple-choice question exam developed by James Mead, Steven LeMay and Richard Hawkins (July 26, 2019).

Will update in the 2020 peer review of assessment on the success of the new instrument and SLOs.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work):

The consensus at the table was that they look forward to seeing how the assessment works over the course of the year.

Mathematics

SLOs Assessed: Mathematics assessed three content SLOs. 1. Recognize and apply principles of abstract mathematics. 2. Describe and use principles of computational and applied mathematics. 3. Recognize principles of theoretical and applied statistics.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: Final exams consisting of 9-11 questions that directly address student learning outcomes.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description:

- 1) Assessed 12 students in the MAA 4211 Advanced Calculus I course, which is required for all Math majors. They analyzed student performance on five select questions; students are considered to have performed poorly as a whole if they score 70% or less on a specific question.
- 2) Assessed 20 students in the MAD 4401 Numerical Analysis course, which is required for all Math majors. The assessment data consists of the overall percentage for how students as a whole performed on each problem (9 questions total). Assessment data is then converted to tables to allow the department to analyze the relative frequency of missed questions.
- 3) Assessed 20 students in the STA 4321 Introduction to Mathematical Statistics I course, which is required for all Math majors. They analyzed performance on seven select questions; students are considered to have performed poorly as a whole if they score 70% or less on a specific question.

Summary of findings: The department assessed each class as a whole rather than identifying the number of students who did or did not meet expectations.

- 1) Of the total points (= 480), students as a whole received 29.3%.
- 2) Of the total points, students as a whole received 65.8%.
- 3) There are only 29% (1.46/5) of the average score percentage on the question 11, only 7 students (23%) scored 80% (4/5 point) on this question, 19 students (63%) failed the question.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: The department identified three deficiencies across the majority of students.

- 1) Students have deficiencies on the applications of the fixed-point theorem, Taylor's expansion and the application of the Euler's method on the initial value problem. They

will establish a proof writing workshop Fall 2019 to help students with these deficiencies. The final exam will remain the same in order to compare.

- 2) Students have deficiencies on determine mean and variance of a random variable. More class time will be spent on Euler's method. The final exam will remain the same in order to compare.
- 3) Students have deficiencies on determine mean and variance of a random variable. The instructor will follow the textbook notation and examples more in lecture as well as spend more time on the deficient topics.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work):

The department sees their biggest challenge in student learning is helping students recognize and apply principles of abstract mathematics. They generally use a comprehensive final exam in three upper-division math courses to assess students. Questions on the exam are related to specific program SLOs. If the passing rate is lower than 70% for any particular question, it is considered a critical question. Faculty discuss these questions to identify changes they might make to improve learning (e.g., if faculty should cover those topics more, or if students should be taking advantage of tutoring or workshops).

The table wondered what happened to students who did not meet the benchmark. Representatives explained that if students do not meet the benchmark, they need to repeat the course. The second time around students are usually more successful, and those who are not need to change their major. This is concerning because compared to assessment data in previous years, the pass rate was much lower than usual in 2018-2019. The department will help faculty with additional resources, including piloting workshops in which students work together to improve their comprehension in problem areas. This is especially important in MAA 4211 Advanced Calculus, which is their gateway class to the major.

The table considered the best way to address student learning through assessment. The conclusion was that all SLOs need to be fully supported by all the faculty, and if they are not perhaps the department needs to consider removing it. This will also help move the department from an 8 year assessment plan to a five year assessment plan.

Mechanical Engineering

SLOs assessed: Students will: 1. Recognize, interpret, and apply concepts of mathematics, science, and engineering. 2. Design and conduct experiments and evaluate and interpret data. 3. Design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, environmental, social, political, ethical, health and safety, manufacturability, and sustainability. 4. Identify and apply the skills necessary to function on multidisciplinary teams. 5. Identify, formulate, and solve engineering problems. 6. Recognize professional and ethical responsibility. 7. Identify and apply the skills necessary to communicate effectively. 8. Recognize the impact of engineering solutions in a global, economic, environmental, and societal context. 9. Recognize the need for, and able to engage in, life-long learning. 10. Recognize and describe contemporary issues. 11. Identify and apply the techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment:

EGS 4032- Quiz 1

EGN 4950 Final Report

EGN 4952L - Team Evaluation

EGN 4950 Final Report

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: The faculty have met to discuss every outcome as required by ABET. Each ABET outcome is mapped to UWF SLOs. Here are some findings, documented in the ABET report: "We discovered students were weak in free body diagrams and reaction forces in the machine design course (EML 3500). We will be spending more time on this subject within the course and we are exploring potential problems in the statics course (EGM 2500). We are working in both courses to increase the coverage in this area. The results of the assessment related to the dynamic systems course (EML 4225) revealed that students had trouble modeling a physical system. We believe this had to do with the system that was chosen for the project. It was too complicated for undergraduate students and was not a good fit for the class project, a new system will be ordered from Quanser and will be put into the class in fall 2018. Our assessments with Outcome 12 also showed that some students did not do a physical design in the thermal systems II course (EML 3016). Instead of forcing all systems to be physical, we will change this assessment to the Capstone II course, where students are required to do a physical realization."

Summary of findings: For the critical thinking SLO (Prepare students to work professionally in either thermal or mechanical systems) most students (70%) met or exceeded the expectations. 12% were satisfactory.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: All instruments are well thought out, especially with the current ABET accreditation.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): These outcomes are in line with the ABET accreditation process. Continue to focus on that process as well as SACSCOC and close the loop. Small faculty department helps with alignment.

Although there were many goals achieved, there is room for improvement as the department looks at the assessment.

Movement Sciences and Health

SLOs assessed: 1. Identify and apply health promotion/education terminology, concepts, and research methods and procedures for program planning. 2. Identify professional opportunities in health promotion. 3. Identify and explain the major concepts and principles related to health promotion/education content knowledge areas. 4. Develop effective oral and writing skills in areas related to health promotion/education. 5. Serve as a health promotion/education resource and community liaison. 6. Recognize and propose solutions to ethical problems related to health promotion/education. 7. Design and implement health promotion programs with specified program goal(s) and objectives.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: Assignment rubric; Exams

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: The overall instrument was the final exam for HSC 4104 which found to be satisfactory way to assess learning.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Results were that 81% met the objective of 70% scoring at least 80% on the final project. Average class score was 79%, including 2 scores of '0' that were not turned in. Of those projects turned in, the average was 88%. Improvement to student learning: include health coaching assessment in the final project. This is a first time assessment. Results will be compared to next year's assessment.

Result of 72% met the object of at least 70% scoring at least 80% on the assignment. The calculation included student who received a score of 0 because they did not turn in the assignment. Of those students who turned in the assignment, the satisfactory percent is 83.5%. Improvement to student learning: 1) revise the rubric to include the minimum number of sentences required for the assignment, 2) encouraging students to turn in assignments. This is a first time assessment. Results will be compared to next year's assessment.

Result of 83% meets the objective of at least 70% of students scoring 80% or above on the final exam. Class average was 88% include 1 student who did not take the exam. Of those who took the exam, the average score was 92%. Improvement to student learning: add exam review. This is a first time assessment. Results will be compared to next year's assessment.

Results of 93% meet the objective of 70% scoring 85% or above on the program development and panel presentation assignment. Improvement to student learning: 1) revise the presentation evaluation tool used by students and panel members with more specific criteria. This is a first time assessment. Results will be compared to next year's assessment.

All students successfully participated in the UWF Health Fair. Improvement to student learning: add a peer evaluation instrument. This is a first time assessment. Results will be compared to next year's assessment.

Result of 61% does not meet the objective of 70% scoring 80% or above on the ethical issues assignment. Average score was 83%. Improvement to student learning: revise the rubric for the assignment with more detailed expectations. This is a first time assessment. Results will be compared to next year's assessment.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): Since this was the first time assessed, the results will be compared to assessment results obtained next year and changes will be made as needed. Suggested to take a look at overall rubrics, how they work in alignment with the SLOs for the program. It was also discussed that for the HSC 4104 final exam, an exam review could increase the overall satisfactory level.

Nursing

SLOs assessed: Content domain SLOs

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: Dr. Hobby stated that Nursing has several accreditation standards that they must meet. Nursing creates evaluations/assignments that meet all of the standards together. The evaluations are kept on a Google Excel file on a shared drive. On the document, the courses and the content to be assessed are listed so that the faculty

can see the assignments that will be evaluated. Using a curriculum map, the faculty know which assignments are going to be followed. Nursing has set a benchmark that states that 85% of students have to pass the assignment or test. Rubrics are used for the assignments.

Nursing also utilizes and student survey that is collected at the end of each course. The survey is anonymous and collects feedback from students about the course. The survey asks students, what they liked, didn't like, and "What would you change" about the course" The survey also asks for feedback about content, course navigation, and communication. Each course has a team that reviews the survey data. The data is then used to make needed changes to the course.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: Education Benchmarks(EBI) 2018 Skyfactor. 1 New York Plaza, New York, NY 10004 is contracted to assess all UWF nursing programs. An exit survey is sent to all graduates via student email to assess program outcomes for accreditation. A one-year alumni survey is sent to all graduate alums via the private email provided. Employment data is collected from the one-year survey, as well as program outcomes. Both surveys document program evaluation for meeting CCNE accreditation standards. The exit survey is sent out to all of the students. The survey asks questions that assess if the program meets accreditation.

Summary of findings: This year Nursing is tracking content SLOs. The benchmark set is that 85% of students will pass the content assignment.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Nursing faculty evaluate all program courses during the Fall semester. The program's evaluation committee assesses the End of Course findings and discusses the evaluations in the spring at a retreat. Faculty discuss recommendations and changes.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): Dr. Hobby reported that it is quite an undertaking to match everything up. The current evaluation plan is being piloted in 2019-2020 academic year. Assessment, evaluation, and recommendations will be made on the fall surveys. The nurse faculty will determine the 2020-2021 assessment plan during spring retreat.

Social Work

SLOs Assessed: Assessed SLOs aligned with competence/content knowledge of graduating BSW students using measures acceptable to Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: The department uses the following assessment tools to evaluate course/program content: Social Work Education and Assessment Program (SWEAP) entrance and exit surveys, Practicum placement instrument (FPPAI), Foundation curriculum assessment instrument (FCAI) pretest and posttest.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

- 1) *Sample description:* Field placement practicum instrument
 - a. In-person or live measure

- b. Students graded on competency level
- 2) **Sample Description:** Standardized measure using SWEAP
 - a. Content measure

Summary of findings: Achievement benchmark set at 70% for direct measures.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: In order to improve and expand upon student learning opportunities the department plans to hire full time tenure track faculty as well as adjunct faculty from diverse backgrounds who are able to teach both face to face and online. They also seek to hire faculty with research and scholarly interest that reflect clinical social work in behavioral and health care settings. Finally, they want to continue to recruit and admit students from diverse backgrounds. Having a diverse faculty, staff, and student body will enrich the educational experience as well as the pedagogy

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): Some faculty brought up that Social Work's assessment process seems to only be guided by accreditation standards. They wondered how disciplinary/standardized competencies line-up with the program's SLOs? The representatives replied with the department recently rewrote their SLOs to fit with the accreditor requirements. They assess all SLOs every year.

After reviewing results the department identified three areas of weakness: Policy, Research, and Evaluation. To improve upon the areas of weakness the department plans to create a seminar for students working in the field. The weekly seminar will hopefully address weakness.

Theatre

SLOs Assessed:

- 1) Interpret and analyze tools and techniques of communication within cultural forms or cultural contexts.
- 2) Identify the intrinsic value of culture and cultural artifacts.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: The department assesses using a written paper and a group project.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

Sample description: The department assessed 52 students in one face-to-face section of THE 2000 Theatre Appreciation. To assess SLO 1 students wrote a paper in which they critically analyzed the play School for Scandal. For SLO 2 they completed a group project—that served as the final exam—for which students assumed the role as director, actor, or designer, and together produced a five-minute film

Summary of findings: Fifty-one students out of 52 met or exceeded expectations (=98% satisfactory) for SLO 1 and all students met or exceeded expectations for the second measure.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: The department would like to choose a different assessment method since most students met expectations for both SLOs using the tools this cycle.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work):

The main discussion revolved around how a department identifies the right tool to assess students that is beneficial to both students and instructors. Some departments are currently utilizing lecture, quizzes, midterms, and final exams. Theatre is considering switching to quizzes.

But faculty caution the use of quizzes. In the quizzes, students are not successful simply because they aren’t doing them. When the students do complete the quizzes, they’re successful. Some wondered if the frequency of the quizzes is too much. Others questioned course organization saying that it might be too easy for students to forget about when it’s online. However, some instructors do not want to take up class time to administer the quizzes. One suggestion was to have the instructor build the Canvas course so that if an online module—including the quiz—is not completed, they cannot proceed to the next one.

Another thought was to take the current framework from General Education course assessments and move them into a major course and use it to assess a program SLO from the ALC. This will allow both levels of assessment—General Education and program—at the same time

Graduate Assessment

Accounting & Finance

SLOs assessed: SLOs in the Critical Thinking and Communication domains: (1) prepare a written analysis of an accounting issue and (2) present an oral presentation on an accounting issue.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: ACG6805 Seminar in Financial Accounting – Written research memo & recorded video presentation

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: Aggregate data across assignments: 14% Very Good; 60% Acceptable; 26% Unacceptable; Written assignment: 9% Very Good (Exceeds); 59% Acceptable (Meets); 31% Unacceptable; Oral Assignment: 20% Very Good (Exceeds); 61% Acceptable; 19% Unacceptable

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Students performed poorly on critical thinking skills (primarily on written assignments). Specifically, they found students’ weaknesses appeared to be in identifying and assessing alternatives and reading and defending a solution. Clarity and cohesion and references were also areas that the faculty noted that students approached a level of concern. Faculty noticed a difference in rating levels based on whether the rater was internal or external to the university.

The faculty plan to evaluate the appropriateness of the college-wide rubrics for undergraduate assessment for use in graduated classes. Additional assessment calibration will occur. The

faculty will continue monitoring inter-rater reliability on the instrument as well as monitor program curriculum to ensure intentionality in scaffolding the learning for students.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work):

The group agreed that this department has a mature and well-established assessment system. There were no weaknesses identified by the group.

Communication & Leadership

SLOs assessed: 24 SLOs have been assessed in the past. The one selected for the annual report was: 3.2 Demonstrate the ability to craft effective communication campaigns and presentations.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: This past year, the program faculty utilized external clients to assess the work of the students.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: 1 student was assessed and he/she received a satisfactory rating.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: There were not enough data to make conclusions about results. Still the faculty did make some changes. First they decided to significantly modify and reduce the number of program SLOs. Further, they plan to monitor student performance data using four program assessments: Capstone project, case studies, oral presentation, and an IRB proposal. The faculty will review the results of performance data during this upcoming year.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work):

The discussion focused on existing weaknesses identified by the faculty of the communication department. Specifically, the faculty believed and the group agreed that 24 SLOs is too overwhelming to manage effectively. In addition, the group agreed that there should be clearly articulated, direct measures to assess student performance instead of relying on outside clients for these assessment results. The discussion focused on positive aspects of what the communication department faculty members described as their next steps. It was agreed that four SLOs will be much more manageable and that having multiple faculty members assess students’ performance using a common rubric will provide valuable data about the program.

**Earth and Environmental Sciences
MS in GIS Administration**

SLOs assessed:

1. MS in GIS Administration: SLO 2.1-Present ideas and geospatial products clearly, effectively, and elegantly in written and oral presentations.

2. MS in Environmental Science: SLO 4.1-Demonstrate general scientific principles of integrity in reports, grant proposals, and thesis.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment:

1. MS in GIS: proposal, final paper and presentation for the capstone. A committee review (in which one member is an external domain expert) assessed students for: 1) A mastery of cartographic skills; 2) Communication of the GIS project process and the results in written,

oral, and graphic media at a professional level; and 3) Demonstration of professional skills of effective communication and project management. Benchmark: At least 70% of students will earn a B or better in the proposal, final paper, and presentation for the capstone.

2. MS in Environmental Science: Assignment and rubric. Benchmark: At least 70% of students will have a score of 9 or more points out of 12points total.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

1. MS in GIS: Three online sections and a total of five students were assessed. 100% of students met or exceeded the expectation.

2. MS in Environmental Science: 6 face-to-face sections with a total of 26 students were assessed. 77% reached the benchmark or surpassed it.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement.

1. MS in GIS: Faculty decided to develop a canvas course site to monitor student progress, with rubrics and more specific guidelines on the format and medium of the presentation. In 2017-18 and in 2018-19 they assessed the same SLO (2.1). In 2019, Faculty decided to create a rubric for the proposal, project write-up, and presentation that the committee reviewers can fill out. They developed new student learning outcomes, a seven-year assessment plan, and a curriculum map which will be updated with the CCR program cycle this year.

2. MS in Environmental Science: Even though students were successful, faculty thought that the rubric was not well suited to measure integrity/values/ethics, and decided to change the assessment instrument. The current rubric was more suited to a different domain. Faculty will reassess and reevaluate this this SLO next year with the new instrument. In addition, the approach to assessing this SLO will be different. Faculty will record the actual number of ethical issues encountered in various courses. The department will compile a list of ethical issues and develop a scoring mechanism which will be finalized and adopted at the first faculty meeting of fall, 2019.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work).

The EES faculty representative appeared to be angry, frustrated, and resentful of “having to do this” when he feels “assessment professionals” should do it. He stated that his dept. feels lost in how to assess integrity in EES, even though they work with CUTLA and a national organization on ethics. He said his dept. doesn’t believe assessment is successful and they are frustrated.

They see the “corporatization” of academics in the assessment requirements workload. He also stated that although assessment is explicitly mentioned to undergrads, it never is to grads.

Suggestions from the group and responses from the faculty member:

- Assessment can be a component of an assignment. Is there a core course with an assignment embedded in it? Yes, they’re doing that already.
- Have students take the integrity quiz the library offers. Faculty member is dubious whether the quiz “works” or not. He said that he’s not sure what they are supposed to be assessing.
- Perhaps have students go through ethics training from the IRB. That suggestion was accepted.
- It appears that EES is assessing the introduction, repetition, and mastery of an SLO. You only have to document mastery. The curriculum map shows how the student gets from

point A to point B, and assessment is just documenting the path. If there are problems in mastery, then go back and assess the earlier steps to see where the weaknesses are.

Department of Educational Research
M.Ed. in College Student Affairs Administration

SLOs assessed: SLO 1.1—Articulate and apply concepts and principles in the delivery of student affairs with college students, staff, administration, and the community. SLO 1.2—Identify and employ applied competencies such as decision-making, planning, budgeting, and program implementation, management, and evaluation. SLO 2.1—Summarize and synthesize student development theories in the application of practice to student affairs. SLO 2.2—Critically evaluate essential program assessment and research skills. SLO 3.1—Facilitate appropriate strategies to influence individual, group, and organizational development in college students and their environments. SLO 3.2—Employ formal and informal verbal communication skills and professional writing. SLO 4.1—Articulate the ethical and legal dilemmas related to student affairs and higher education. SLO 4.2—Adhere to an awareness and concern for community, diversity, and individual differences

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) for assessment:

SLO 1.1: A rubric for the Comprehensive Assignment; Benchmark: 100% of students will score at the met target range or higher on all components of the rubric. SLO 1.2: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher the ability to prepare a budget for a program in higher education as demonstrated on the designed budget rubric. SLO 2.1: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher the ability to synthesize student development theories in an assigned research paper. SLO 2.2: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher, the ability to assess a current student affairs program at UWF. SLO 3.1: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher the ability to display appropriate helping skills through a recorded video. SLO 3.2: A rubric; Benchmark: 100% of students will score at the met target range or higher on all components of the rubric for the Comprehensive Assignment. SLO 4.1: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate a satisfactory level or higher on application of ethical/legal issues in higher education by means of case study analysis. SLO 4.2: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher self-awareness of diversity issues as well as concern for community and individual differences through reflection papers, presentations and immersion experiences.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used:

SLO 1.1 Sample description: 1 section of 12 students assessed. 100% of the students scored satisfactory. SLO 1.2 Sample description: 1 section of 12 students were assessed. 92% of the students were able to satisfactorily prepare a budget for a higher education program. SLO 2.1 Sample description: 1 section of 12 students was assessed and 100% of students scored satisfactorily. SLO 2.2 Sample description: 1 section of 12 students was assessed and 100% of students scored satisfactorily. SLO 3.1 Sample description: 1 section of 12 students was assessed and 100% of students scored satisfactorily. SLO 3.2 Sample description: 1 section of 12 students was assessed and 100% of students scored satisfactorily. SLO 4.1 Sample description: 1 section

of 12 students was assessed and 100% of students scored satisfactorily. SLO 4.2 Sample description: 1 section of 12 students was assessed and 100% of students scored satisfactorily.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Faculty determined that the Comprehensive Assignment rubric satisfactorily measures SLO1.1. Faculty will focus on fine-tuning the 3 sections of the Comprehensive Assignment. Although the benchmark was met for SLO 1.2, additional examples will be used next time to ensure mastery of content. The faculty determined that the assignment of the research paper satisfactorily measures SLO 2.1. For the next assessment cycle, an additional assessment instrument will be developed to reinforce students' knowledge of the theories. They also determined that the assignment associated with the course satisfactorily measures SLO 2.2. For the next assessment cycle, an additional assessment instrument will be developed to reinforce students' knowledge of research skills. The faculty determined that the assessment satisfactorily measured SLO 3.1, however, the faculty also determined that students needed more practice with the issues that occur within the college environment. Faculty will add a practice component for the next assessment cycle.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): The scheduled representative was not present, and the faculty member assigned to attend and report had no knowledge of the M.Ed. program. He works with Ed.D. students only, and also was not familiar with the assessment documents submitted about the M.Ed. program. The faculty member spoke in detail about the extensive support that the dept. provides for the Ed.D. students, but it had no relevance to the M.Ed. program being assessed.

Government: MA—Political Science

SLOs assessed: SLO 2.7—Synthesize theory, evidence, and applications to produce an intelligible conclusion or solution to the original question.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: A rubric is used to evaluate both written and oral comprehensive exam performance. Rubric elements include knowledge, argument, and style. Benchmark: At least 70% of students will be able to demonstrate disciplinary knowledge of literature, concepts, theory and methods, develop clear and strong arguments, and exhibit good grammar and writing style. Student outcomes are honors pass, pass, or fail and all students with the first two outcomes are considered to have met the benchmark.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: Three face-to-face students and three online students were assessed. 100% of students satisfied the benchmark.

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: It is rare that the department does not see 100% of students satisfying the benchmark. To attempt to get more out of their assessment, a faculty committee derived a new rubric for use in 2019-20. The new rubric better aligns SLOs with rubric elements and has greater variation in terms of scoring the outcome rather than essentially a dichotomous outcome of pass / fail. They expect to be able to see more fine grained data on specific areas where students are both stronger and weaker from our 2019-20 rubric.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work):

One difficulty with assessment in this dept. is the various sub-fields across Political Science, and how to assess competence in sub-fields with very different requirements. In the past they found that these SLOs, especially on critical thinking, are not only hard to empirically track, but also are hard to use in all sub-fields. They now have a dept. committee on assessment that has streamlined the SLOs. With new, more valid SLOs, they are again awarding categories to graduate students, such as “graduate with honors.”

- One issue the group discussed is when assessment takes place. Only students who make it to the thesis defense/comprehensive exam are assessed. They are deemed ready when they choose a thesis advisor or are ready to take comps. Adam gives practice to his students in what a comps question would be so that they are more prepared for comps when they get there.
- Students are coming and going in the graduate program, and some don’t make it to the end of the program. The group asked if early assessments would be helpful to see why some students don’t make it to the end of the program. The dept. has struggled with how to assess graduate students earlier in the program.
- This program defines critical thinking by examining different interpretations and synthesizing evidence. The SLO uses the term “adjudicate” –critical thinking includes the abilities to synthesize, adjudicate, and rationalize. The group reacted very positively to the use of those terms and focus on those skills.
- The group asked if the SLOs were discussed with students so that they would know what will be expected and assessed. The faculty member thought that they don’t explicitly talk about assessment, but SLOs are on syllabi. The group suggested they explain to the students that they will be assessed for specific skills/practices.

MBA Program

SLO assessed: SLO 1.1—Analyze key elements of a complex business problem. SLO 2.1—Develop an effective written presentation of a business issue. SLO 2.2—Deliver an effective original oral presentation of a business issue. SLO 3.1—Ethical decision makers—identify an ethical issue. SLO3.2— Ethical decision makers—identify, discuss, and develop conclusions. SLO 4.1 (a)—Complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including an economic analysis of the cost structure and profitability of a selected industry. SLO 4.1 (b)—Complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including a financial analysis of publicly traded firms in a selected industry including ration and common size analysis. SLO 4.1 (c)—Complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including a common market analysis. SLO 4.1 (d)—Complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including to compile and present effective arguments to support recommendations derived from analytical models. SLO 4.2—Assess various accounting issues to determine the proper accounting treatment according to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles in the US. SLO 4.3— Develop data driven analytical solutions for complex business decision-making problems. SLO 4.4—Describe relationship of HRM and organizational strategy. SLO 4.6— Recognize new venture ideas and synthesize into well-structured business plan for a new business endeavor. SLO 4.8—Apply knowledge of

global marketplaces to plan and perform international logistics operations within global business networks.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment:

SLO 1.1: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher the ability to synthesize complex information to make business decisions. SLO 2.1: A rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher the ability to develop professional written presentations on advanced business topics. SLO 2.2: Oral Presentation Rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will demonstrate at the satisfactory level or higher the ability to produce professional oral presentations on advanced business topics. SLO 3.1: Exam questions; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to identify an ethical issue. SLO 3.2: Portfolio paper rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to identify, discuss, and develop conclusions.

SLO 4.1(a): Portfolio Paper Rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including an economic analysis of the cost structure and profitability of a selected industry. SLO 4.1 (b): Portfolio paper rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including a financial analysis of publicly traded firms in a selected industry including ratio and common size analysis. SLO 4.1(c): Portfolio paper rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including a common market analysis. SLO 4.1(d): Portfolio paper rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to complete an in-depth analysis of an industry across functional areas of business including to compile and present effective arguments to support recommendations derived from analytical models.

SLO 4.2: Oral presentation rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to assess various accounting issues to determine the proper accounting treatment according to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles in the US. SLO 4.3: Rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to develop data driven analytical solutions for complex business decision making problems. SLO 4.4: Rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to devise a well-structured human resource plan that aligns with organizational strategy. SLO 4.6: Rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to synthesize new venture ideas into a well-structured business model. SLO 4.8: Rubric; Benchmark: At least 80% of students will be able to apply knowledge of global marketplaces to plan and perform international logistics operations within global business networks.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used.

SLO 1.1 Sample description: Three sections total were assessed: one on the main campus (13 students), one in Germany (8 students), and one online (37 students), for a total of 3 sections and 58 students. All campuses met the assessment targets but there were areas of deficiency in Financial Analysis, Probability and Leverage, and Metrics and Industry Trends. SLO 2.1 Sample description: Three sections total were assessed: one on the main campus (13 students), one in Germany (8 students), and one online (37 students), for a total of 3 sections and 58 students.

Summary of findings: All campuses met the assessment targets but there were areas of deficiency in grammatical issues. SLO 2.2 Sample description: Three sections total were assessed: one on the main campus (11 students), one in Germany (8 students), and one online (56 students), for a total of 3 sections and 75 students. Even though all the campuses met the assessment targets (100%), there were still some notable areas of deficiencies indicated on the analytic rubric to include: (1). Use of an effective attention getter; (2). Use of smooth transitions; and (3). Presentations stayed within the allotted time. SLO 3.1 Sample description: 4 sections were assessed: one on the main campus (10 students), one in Germany (8 students), and one online (57 students), for a total of 3 sections and 75 students. Even though all the campuses met the assessment targets (100%), there were still some notable areas of deficiency at the granular level including changes in the regulatory environment of the government and applied ethics in the business environment. SLO 3.2 Sample description: 2 sections were assessed: one on the main campus (24 students) and one in Germany (14 students), for a total of 2 sections and 38 students. Even though all the campuses met the assessment targets (100%), there were still some notable areas of deficiency at the granular level including changes in the regulatory environment of the government and applied ethics in the business environment.

SLO 4.1 (a) Sample description: 3 sections were assessed: one on the main campus (38 students), one in Germany (14 students), and one online (146 students), for a total of 3 sections and 198 students. All the campuses met the assessment targets (100%). SLO 4.1(b) Sample description: 3 sections were assessed: one on the main campus (29 students), one in Germany (14 students), and one online (25 students), for a total of 3 sections and 68 students. Overall, the campuses met the assessment target (95%); however, there were still some notable areas of deficiency at the granular level in these areas: Review Ratios, Reasons for Differences, Overall Evaluation, Overall Risk, and Cost of Capital. SLO 4.1(c) Sample description: 2 sections were assessed: one on the main campus (24 students) and one in Germany (14 students), for a total of 2 sections and 38 students. All campuses met the assessment targets (100%). SLO 4.1(d) Sample description: 3 sections were assessed: one on the main campus (18 students), one in Germany (14 students), and one online (73 students), for a total of 3 sections. All the campuses met the assessment targets (100%), but the online campus did perform noticeably weaker.

SLO 4.2 Sample description: 2 online sections were assessed, for a total of 41 students. All the campuses met the assessment targets (100%). SLO 4.3 Sample description: 1 online section was assessed, for a total of 29 students. All the campuses met the assessment targets (100%). SLO 4.4 Sample description: 1 online section was assessed, for a total of 28 students. Even though all the campuses met the assessment targets (100%) deficiencies there were some notable areas of deficiencies indicated on the analytic rubric to include using relevant sources to support the HRM theoretical references. SLO 4.6 Sample description: 1 online section was assessed, for a total of 16 students. All the campuses met the assessment targets (100%). SLO 4.8 Sample description: 1 online section was assessed, for a total of 11 students. All the campuses met the assessment targets (100%).

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: Faculty members recommended creating new tailored presentations on conducting DuPont analysis. In addition, students are unclear on the use of "Metrics" and that term is inconsistent with industry terminology. The rubric and supporting course materials will adopt Benchmarks to better describe the expectation

for work product. For Trend Discussion, the issue is the omission of this requirement. Faculty members have integrated a full review of the final paper rubric into weekly Webex sessions hosted for students. Faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in an increase of students at the met or exceeded the expectation mark (from 91% to 100%). At the COB Day of Assessment, faculty noted that there was no longitudinal data related to critical thinking as the assessment for this SLO takes place at the beginning of the program. As a result, in conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee updated the SLO related to this domain to better evaluate the domain--and instituted an end of program assessment via the MBA Portfolio using the College of Business Critical Thinking Rubric. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

To specifically addresses issues with SLO 2.1 Faculty members have recommended instituting the use of the tool Grammarly for students to better identify and edit their grammatical issues and problems prior to submission. Faculty will reassess next cycle and re-evaluate under a new SLO. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: At the COB Day of Assessment, faculty noted that there were issues with APA Formatting including appropriate use of citations. An APA Quiz was added to the GEB5930 course and presentations on key APA topics were updated. Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in an increase of students at the met or exceeded the expectation mark (from 93% to 100%). Also, in conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the domain. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

The faculty members have also recommended creating new tailored presentations for the three specific areas to provide students with additional guidance on these deliverables. Faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: At the COB Day of Assessment, faculty noted that there were issues with a lack of peer review in the evaluation of student's oral presentation performance. A Qualtrics survey was developed to now capture peer-review information. Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in an increase of students at the met or exceeded the expectation mark (from 92% to 100%). Also, in conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the domain. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

To improve work on ethical reasoning, faculty members have recommended new online lectures to be created for all delivery platforms to review. In addition, discussion activities (classroom and online) will focus on the ethics of actual corporate activities and polices and the implications of those policies on the various stakeholder groups. Faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in an increase of students at the met or exceeded the expectation mark (from 98% to 100%). In conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee,

the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the learning. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

Faculty members have also recommended modifying course materials to further discuss the logic of the various ratios, modifying project requirements to ask students to justify their choice of ratios and why they were the most significant ratios for their chosen company and industry, and sample projects were provided to students that included good discussions of the reasons why a firm's ratios were changing over time or were different from the ratios of competitors. Ratios were grouped together by their primary emphasis (e.g., liquidity, asset management, debt management, profitability, etc.). Faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in an increase of students at the met or exceeded the expectation mark (from 96% to 97%). As noted, in conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee, the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the learning. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

The research paper requires multiple submissions throughout the semester giving the student feedback to improve the submission resulting in a polished final submission. However, the Faculty members have revised and updated the course material under the Canvas Blue Print Model. Faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in an increase of students at the met or exceeded the expectation mark (from 96% to 100%). In conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee, the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the learning. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

The online delivery mode will be monitored closely for a pattern of lower achievement. Faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in no change at the met or exceeded the expectation mark (from 87% to 87%). In conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee, the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the learning. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

For SLO 4.3 faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: Course modifications made during the last assessment period resulted in an increase of students at the exceeded the expectation mark (from 80% to 100%). In conjunction with the MBA Task Force (comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee, the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the learning. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

The faculty members recommended having the Business Librarian conduct a refresher quality sources presentation so students remember how to identify and employ scholarly sources in their research. Faculty will reassess under the new SLO next cycle and re-evaluate. Closing the loop from 2017-2018: Did not assess this SLO last year. In conjunction with the MBA Task Force

(comprised of MBA faculty) and the Graduate Programs Curriculum and Assurance of Learning Committee, the SLO related to this domain was updated to better assess the learning. This new SLO will be evaluated in 2019-2020 for the first time.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work):

COB has additional complications because they are assessing across three campuses: face-to-face classes at UWF, online classes, and face-to-face classes in Germany. The virtual environment has different challenges, and they work with those students so that they can deal with those challenges. For instance, they provide tutorials on how to use Webex for virtual meetings.

COB faculty gather annually on one day and share assessment practices. This has been a successful model for the college, and faculty have “bought-into” it. They have worked hard to streamline the process so that it is not only accepted by faculty, but provides valuable information. Faculty do not see this as work-heavy. When faculty see the data and also realize that this process is not for the purpose of criticizing them, they see the value of assessment. That positive attitude of the faculty has made their assessments and programs very successful. In between that annual meeting, they have an MBA Task Force that meets every two weeks during the year.

COB also has outside accreditation standards that they have to meet. They have worked hard on aligning those requirements with UWF assessments so that they are not doing double work. Their accreditation agency drives a lot of the language and things that are assessed...they're trying to mesh that with what the university requires for assessment. John T. suggested that they look at where there is a crosswalk between ALP assessment and AACSB accreditation benchmarks. One necessary item for their accreditation is “Closing the Loop”—assessing and identifying areas for improvement, and then returning to those areas and reassess to determine whether the change had the expected effect or not. The group agreed that the act of “Closing the Loop” is essential for assessment to be valuable.

In their programs, COB uses standard rubrics. More specific assessments in the rubrics are working for them. Important point is to share data with faculty at the annual meeting. They look at what exists currently and try to use that and expand it or insert new items so that it works smoothly. In assessing their citation method, they use a more granular assessment. Assessing Critical Thinking involves a very detailed rubric. Being specific works for them. Faculty found that grading became more precise when SLOs were written in clear and specific language.

COB is currently testing the component in Canvas, “Outcomes,” which could make data collection much easier. If successful, it could be offered across campus to streamline data collection for Assessment. This could help address the difficulties in evaluating online classes on a level playing field as f2f classes.

Feedback from the group was very positive. They were most impressed that faculty were supportive of the assessment process and valued it. Obviously, much effort has gone into optimizing and streamlining the process over the years. One interesting discussion was whether

or not to share the ALP with incoming grad students and be clear that this is what is expected. Since rubrics are part of all courses—how aware of them are students?

Public Administration MSA

SLO assessed: Articulate and apply a public service perspective utilizing ethical judgment and principles (integrity/values)

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: Policy related written paper

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: 98% Satisfactory (N = 51)

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: There appears to be a misalignment between measures and outcomes. 98% of students received a level of satisfactory. The department plans to review the current assignments to determine what improvements to the process and/or measures are necessary. The MSA program faculty updated the program SLOs approximately two years ago. However, it appears that curricular and/or assessment changes were not made at that time. Instead, faculty continued using existing assignments and rubrics to measure student performance.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work): The program purpose and goals appear to be unclear. The group suggested that the departmental and/or program leadership facilitate a discussion about the program and its purpose, then determine how to best improve the quality of the program assessments and alignment to the purpose of the program. Additionally, the faculty may need to engage in curricular updates that better align to the program purpose and goals. Further, the department leadership may consider an outside consultant to work with faculty related to taking a close look at the program and developing measures that elicit evidence of validity and reliability.

Public Health

SLO assessed: Compare the organization, structure and function of health care, public health and regulatory systems across national and international settings.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: Individual student assignment: PHC6150 Public Health Policy: Case study analysis – student develops a comparative analysis paper contrasting the US healthcare structure and those of other developed, and low-to-middle income countries.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: 3 students (16%) Below expectations; 84% met or exceeded expectations (expectations are based on the number of points a student receives on the assignment).

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: They determined that the existing curriculum, assignment, and SLOs did not align. The faculty pilot-tested a new assessment tool during the spring of 2019. The course is currently taught by an adjunct new to Canvas. Since

these data were collected, the course was restructured for better alignment with the SLOs. The faculty will compare the 2019 and 2020 results at their annual data retreat.

The department leadership is reviewing additional data collected from summer 2019 in order to determine evidence of reliability.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program's assessment work):

Based on the information provided, there was consensus among the group members that the program faculty have a good plan moving forward with assessing this particular SLO. It appears that the department has two formal occasions in which faculty participate in the assessment process (curriculum committee meetings and an annual data retreat held each spring). These opportunities for faculty involvement appear to be a strength of the assessment process in the department.

Teacher Education & Educational Leadership

SLO assessed: TEEL did not submit any graduate assessment reports during the 2018-2019 year. Thus, the representative described the assessment process for the graduate programs in TEEL.

Direct measure(s) (optional indirect) used for assessment: No report was completed. Based on a verbal description, TEEL has a variety of both direct and indirect measures of assessment for its graduate programs.

Two types of programs – certification vs. non-certification; assessment process varies for each type.

Certification programs (Educational Leadership & Reading Education) – program faculty identify key assignments within the program that are used to measure student performance on program SLOs. Common rubrics are used by all instructors of the courses. Calibration exercises are ongoing to ensure the program faculty capture evidence of reliability. Data for these assignments are housed within the Tk20 electronic management system.

Certification programs also use multiple indirect measures of program quality. Specifically, they survey all candidates as they complete their programs, they survey employers during the graduates' first three years of employment, and they survey their alumni one-year post graduation. These data are collected, compiled, and analyzed by the CEPS Office of Assessment, Accreditation, and Strategic Planning.

Non-certification programs (ESE, Curriculum & Instruction) – Action Research project is used to assess program SLOs for all students that are not enrolled in a certification program. Data for these programs are housed within individual courses and are not aggregated across programs.

Summary of assessment findings, including a description of the sample used: Data were not reported

Summary of use of assessment findings for improvement: The faculty report strengths in their process and weaknesses in their data collection and management system. There are multiple data

available; however, in some cases, the data are not summarized and reviewed by faculty in a consistent manner.

Faculty plan to continue seeking resources to obtain a qualified individual to consistently summarize data for faculty review.

Feedback from the discussion (strengths and weaknesses of program’s assessment work):

The faculty plan to complete their assessment reports from the previous year as well as begin to consistently monitor SLO performance data. Because there were no graduate level assessment reports available to the group, there was little feedback about strengths and weaknesses. The group agreed that the education programs need to have a consistent data manager in order to successfully monitor candidate progress. Some departments provide course-releases to faculty members to complete these duties and others use an assessment individual that is hired in this role. Further, the group suggested that the non-certification program faculty aggregate the action research project data by program area and begin monitoring progress on the program student learning outcomes that are aligned to that project. Finally, they also suggested that the faculty consider adding a mid-point assessment in the program instead of waiting until the end to assess student performance on the program SLOs.

Discussion and General Observations from the Peer Review Debriefing/CASL Meeting, November 20, 2019

Problems Encountered this Year: Issues to fix or Address for 2019

We continue to face issues with departments being able to “tell their story” effectively using the Qualtrics forms. Reports are still hard to understand and inconsistent. Angela Bryan is currently working with departments on new excel spreadsheet reports that might correct this issue.

We faced some issues with the meeting space. It was too small, and thus the tables were too close to one another making hearing an issue. We also did not have enough accessible outlets for lab tops, making a few scribes have to take hand written notes. We need to be sure we have plenty of outlets and space for next year.

Strengths: Characteristics of Peer Review we should preserve for future events

The diversity of programs at tables continues to be one of the most highlighted strengths of the Peer Review meeting. Not only does this advance assessment preparation, but it also builds overall university collegiately and community.

As we had several new scribes and facilitators, we brought back the advance meeting and worked with Angela Bryan to create a new Scribe/Facilitator guide. This seemed to really help focus conversations and helped scribes record clear notes that captured important elements of the assessment process. We provided the guides on the website and hard copies at the tables. The guidelines seemed to help all participants.

We again witnessed, good, concentrated discussions at tables. Consistent feedback demonstrates that discussions were collegial and useful. One table in particular commented that this had been the most useful and productive meeting they had attended.

We limited table size by allowing some departments to rotate years they participate for the second time. This was facilitated further by the introduction of General Education Making Sense meeting that eliminated the General Education tables from Peer Review. The lack of large tables with six or seven departments allowed the entire meeting to move efficiently and for each department to have a little more time to discuss.

Suggestions for 2020 Peer Review of Assessment: Recommended Actions for Improvement

We will continue to stress the importance that Chairs send informed representatives to the Peer Review. If a Chair wants to invite a new faculty member to the Peer Review to learn about assessment processes at UWF, the new person should attend as an observer and the department should be represented by a faculty member who can actually explain and answer questions about the department's assessment work.

We will also better prepare Facilitators to deal with unprepared representatives or to refocus discussions that are off topic. This year was an improvement, but we still experienced a few issues. Future facilitator/scribe trainings might include specific guidance (and, perhaps, a role play activity) on how to refocus a discussion or defuse a rant.

Returning to the original Google site and working closer with IE helped with meeting preparation. We will continue to work closely with IE to facilitate document access. We will also re-emphasize preparation and facilitators contacting their table earlier with very specific instructions. This should happen at least a week in advance so representatives have time to evaluate assessment reports.

Power strips need to be provided for all tables. To have adequate space for all the tables, and to eliminate cross talk, we will reserve all three rooms of the Conference Center or another large space and spread the tables out as much as possible. We will also only serve finger food using Aramark since they did a great job this year.

Formal Evaluation of Peer Review of Assessment

A Qualtrics survey to evaluate Peer Review of Assessment was distributed to all participants. As of December 2 (survey closes December 6), 10 individuals have completed the survey (representing a 22% response rate). As in previous years, responses are largely positive. All responses indicated that discussions were collegial *most of the time* or *always*. In addition, 89% indicated that discussion would help the department improve future assessment work (endorsing *somewhat agree*, *agree*, or *strongly agree*) and 100% indicated the discussions would help the department improve student learning. Respondents were generally enthusiastic about the Peer Review experience (80% said they would be interesting in participating again).

Open-ended comments indicated that participants appreciated hearing about how other departments managed their assessment work and that they learned useful strategies from other disciplines. Suggestions for improvements focused mainly on the challenges encountered with the poor sound quality in the room, with many comments about the smallness of the room and the associated problems with crowding, noise, and cross-talk between tables,