Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18   *Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

Unit/Program Name: MS and PhD in Biology   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Rusty Gonser. Rusty.gonser@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the assessment website.

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?
1. Achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession 1.	1. See rubric below for student knowledge through presentation 2. Required Area Seminar course. Course used BIO 680 Seminar in Genetics and Evolution	See rubric below	**Of the 6 students evaluated all 6 (100%) exceeded expectations.**	We will continue with the program as is. The results indicate that students can assimilate content knowledge and communicate to others.
2.				
3.				

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Notes
  a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
  b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
  c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark."
  d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., "85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark").

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

1b: The discoveries assessment with the required Area Seminar Course demonstrated that our graduate students exceeded expectations in both their understanding of advanced material, and their ability to present it to a knowledgeable audience. Since area seminars require graduate students to dissect, analyze, debate, discuss, and present advanced primary literature in our field, "exceeding expectation" in this domain implies that the graduate students in our program have achieved the required level of mastery of foundational knowledge. In particular, the observation that all graduate students exceeded expectations in this Area Seminar-based assessment, while several of these same students struggled somewhat in our previous Grant Writing and Presentation-based assessments, indicates their improvement. Note that skillsets examined in the previous assessment, advanced understanding and application of foundational knowledge in the field and the ability to communicate it, were also examined in this current assessment, thereby making this an accurate evaluation of learning improvement.

2: Our graduate program comprises both 2-year long MS programs, and ~5-year long PhD programs. We therefore use a 2-year alternating assessment criteria to evaluate the success of our program and the improvement in learning outcomes of our graduate students – one year focusing on students' grant writing and research presentation skillsets, the other on the student's demonstrated abilities in Area Seminar. These 2-year alternating assessment criteria ensure that students in the 2-year MS program are evaluated using the same methodology as PhD students. Since this year's assessment focused on Area Seminar courses, next year's assessment will focus again on Grant Writing and Research Presentations, both essential skillsets for professionals in our field.

3: This Information will be shared with other stakeholders through the Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities
Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. Our two-year assessment cycle demonstrates that designed contracts of study and the program are working	The Graduate Affairs committee is responsible for insuring that faculty teaching the course complete assessment.	We will be assessing work in the other two required courses this year.	Many of the challenges are met by admitting students that are prepared for the rigor of graduate education. These results validate our current selection process.	No changes to the graduate program as much of the program is directed by the individual mentorship between graduate advisor and student.

2.				
3.				

Notes

   a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).

   c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See Blue Reports database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the Office of Institutional Research for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

The current course/program assessment indicates that our graduate students are well prepared prior to admission to the program. There development continues as evidence by all students exceeding expectations. Furthermore, students that struggled early in the program now achieve at the "exceeding expectations" level in this assessment. Therefore to excel in an area seminar a student needs to learn from presentation and grant writing courses that develop oral and written communication skills. Area seminar allows students to focus on specific documents. Students need to have a good foundational knowledge. Students work with their advisors and graduate committees to develop a customized program of study. The area seminar is focused and allows students to demonstrate their ability to assimilate knowledge and demonstrate mastery.

BIO 680 – Seminar in Genetic Evolution (Genetics as a Research Tool)
Student Presentation Evaluation Form

Presenter: _____

Evaluator: _____

Criteria	Excellent (3)	Good (2)	Fair (1)	Poor (0)	Score
Preparation	Presenter clearly put exceptional effort into preparation and design.	Presenter demonstrated very good preparation and design.	Presenter's work showed some evidence of preparation.	Presenter's work appeared to have been done at the last minute.	
Visual aids (Powerpoint slides)	The visual aids added greatly to the presentation.	The visual aids were clear and helpful.	Visual aids were used, but were wordy or could have been more helpful.	Visual aids were not particularly useful or were not used.	

Organization	The presentation was exceptionally logical and superbly organized.	The presentation had a clear introduction, body and conclusion.	The presentation was generally organized, but lacked some clarity.	The presentation was poorly organized or ideas were presented randomly.	
Articulation and understanding of the material	Excellent and clear articulation of major and minor points. Presenter was able to answer questions with aplomb.	Explained ideas well. Questions were answered effectively.	Ideas were stated, but lacked some clarity. Questions could have been answered more effectively.	Ideas were difficult to understand. Presenter appeared unprepared to handle questions.	
Time management	Presenter showed excellent time management skills.	Presenter finished within the allotted time.	Presenter went over the time limit a little.	Presenter seemed unaware of the time or how to manage it.	
				Total	

Dear Rusty,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: MS & PhD Biology	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Developing (1.625/3.00) **Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): n/a**	
Strengths	**Recommendations**
- Good alignment with a Graduate Student Learning Outcome. - Rubric is fairly clear with good distinction between scoring levels for the most part. So long as it was administered by just one faculty member in this one course it seems there are no concerns for reliability in scoring. - Useful discussion of findings, including the differentiation between content knowledge and communication evaluations in the rubric. This distinction is helpful in figuring out how to apply findings to improve or continue to support student learning. - Clear information provided about the rotating assessment cycle.	- Make sure to note your own program learning outcome that aligns with the GSLO provided. Drawing this connection to your own program learning outcomes is essential. - Make note of expectations for student performance. You note that all students exceeded expectations, but what was the expectation – scoring "good" or "excellent" on the rubric, or on certain areas of the rubric that align with this learning outcome? - Describe how program faculty were involved in assessment or how assessment findings were shared among faculty. - Consider the ways you may use these findings to inform students of their learning, help faculty recognize and share effective practices, and/or increase expectations of student performance to deepen cognitive abilities. **For Part 2 of the report – student success goal setting is related to assessment, but is separate. For future planning cycles, consider the student success goals you have for your students (related to recruitment, retention, persistence, completion, and job/continuing education placement). Anything you're targeting to enrich student learning, experience, and success can be a goal listed here.**

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included below with no notations just for your reference (the SSC did not choose to report in this way).
Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.	No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.

Analysis & Results	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals. Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures). Results are shared in relation to performance goals.	Data is collected using the measures and tools identified. Results are reported with little description of analysis.	No data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice. A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.	Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice. Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.	Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.	No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice. No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	x **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)**Unit/Program:**
Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/ challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	□ **Undeveloped**	□ **Developing**	□ **Mature**	□ **Exemplary**