Academic Program:	Multidisciplinary Studies (MST)	**Date:**	
Author(s):	Ruth Fairbanks, Katherine Lee, Thomas Steiger		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		_X__ Learning Outcomes _X__ Curriculum Map _X__ Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		___ Yes _X__ No ___ Hybrid	

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Benchmark for Proficiency**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark**	**Prior Results for Comparison** (if applicable)
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
SLO 1.3: Students persuade, inform, explain to, or perform for (as appropriate to their course of study) their audiences.	MST 401, Spring 2022 Note: MST typically assesses its Fall MST 401, but the transition from Blackboard to Canvas made this difficult, hence the decision to assess the Spring 22	Research Project		Goal: 80% of students will receive a B or higher on their research project.	100% received a B or higher.	N/A

	course instead.					
SLO 2.3: Use different disciplines in conjunction with one another to explore and explain intellectual problems.	MST 401, Spring 2022	Slideshow component of research project that asks them to address how their concentrations/minors contributed to their findings. They will directly address the question of how interdisciplinarity contributed to their research and analysis processes.		Goal: 100% of students will complete the section of the slideshow component.	100% completed this slideshow component.	N/A
SLO 3.1: Acquire problem-solving skills from at least two different disciplines	MST 401 Spring 2022	Slideshow component of research project that asks them to address how their concentrations/majors contributed to their problem-solving in completing the project. Again, this component will ask students to directly engage with the idea of interdisciplinarity and the ways it has informed their development as scholars and researchers.		Goal: 100% of students will complete the section of the slideshow component.	100% completed this slideshow component.	N/A

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in Blue Reports to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	MST401 is taught online cross-listed with GS499, which is mandated to be offered online. This presents unique challenges. Having weekly steps that students must do in

	a sequence helps keep them on target to complete a project which many are not generally prepared to execute. While we have lost students in the past, that was not a problem in this cycle. While student success activities are necessary, increasing the number of students in MST 401 is perhaps, arguably, more important. The larger pool of MST students would no doubt help with success.
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	As mentioned above, the cross-listing of MST 401 with GS 499 continues to be pedagogically tricky, as those who teach it must address an array of issues, including career-readiness, the research process, and interdisciplinarity. That said, the resident faculty are committed to teaching the course. This was not always the case in the past, and previous sections of MST 401/GS 499 were sometimes taught by lecturers. MST has since developed a rotation system, whereby each faculty member will teach the course for an academic year, thus providing an opportunity to develop and fine-tune the course from fall to spring. The department is currently debating about adding an MST 301 that would require students to prepare their research proposals and include career readiness (which students should ideally address well before they become seniors). The proposal would subsequently be executed in MST 401 and likely contribute significantly to student success. Again, however, low MST student numbers require the cross-listing with GS 499, and an inquiry about adding a GS 399 equivalent to MST 301 was flatly turned down. Hence, we are considering offering an MST 401 that isn't cross-listed with General Studies once per year. Without a two-course sequence, the myriad demands on the course compel those teaching it to touch upon interdisciplinarity and problem-solving but not integrate these issues in as substantively as faculty would prefer, or as students ostensibly need.

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*	It appears that the "drop out" problem is not continuing, but the small "cohort" sizes are a different issue. Certinaly the requirement to ask students to reflect on their interdisciplinarity (without enough development of that in the course itself) is an

	improvement but is only a start. There are structural issues that must be dealt with before any significant changes can be accomplished.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	This question does not quite fit for a class which essentially entails overseeing thirty independent studies. Some research projects are quantitative in nature. To improve performance for those students might require getting them access to a statistical program (which Dr. Steiger did, but it was not fully accessible for all students). Students used "free" survey software, but the free versions only permitted very limited sample sizes and the students did not receive their raw data for analysis. These are unfortunate impediments to student learning and success. Similarly, for students who used more qualitative data such as conducting either content analysis or face-to-face interviews, having access to software such as Ethnograph or NVIVO would enhance their learning and success. Research for the course, as Dr. Steiger taught it, involves collecting and analyzing data to answer a research question. There are many resources that students do not know how to use, and teaching those skills while also teaching them to analyze the data is just not conducive to improving performance and/or learning. They earn their grades with these conditions in mind, but they are being hampered in terms of real learning "success."
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	**Assessment Plan for AY 22-23:** MST will assess the following learning objectives from Dr. Ruth Fairbanks's MST 401: ▪ ***SLO 1.1: Students understand the material they read, hear, and see.*** SLO 1.1 will be assessed through the discussion board posts in the early part of the semester that deal with common readings and materials about the process of research and writing. Benchmark: 75% of the students who complete these posts will earn a B or higher on this set of discussion board posts (about 3-4 weeks of posts will deal with common materials on research and writing). ▪ ***SLO 2.3: Use different disciplines in conjunction with one another to explore and explain intellectual problems.***

	SLO 2.3 will be assessed through the final paper. Benchmark: 75% of the students who turn in the final paper will get a B or higher on the final paper. ▪ ***SLO 3.3: Apply a variety of skills in addressing problems or situations.*** SLO 3.3 will be assessed through the research presentation. Benchmark: 75% of the students who make their research presentation will get a B or higher on the research presentation.
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	Four faculty worked on this assessment: MST 401 instructors for AY 21-22 and 22-23 (Drs. Steiger and Fairbanks, respectively), Curricular Affairs Committee Chairperson Dr. Lain Mathers, and Interim Chairperson Lee. Three of the four—Drs. Fairbanks, Lee, and Steiger—authored the report. This information will be shared with the Curricular Affairs Committee and discussed with the department as needed.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: BA Multidisciplinary Studies
Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)		Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) ***–it could be, but the choice of evaluation method limits this; see notes*** Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) ***–it could be, but the choice of evaluation method limits this; see notes*** Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)	A research project is an excellent assignment for assessment considering it typically includes complex and interconnected demonstrations of mastery of multiple learning outcomes. In this case, a cumulative grade on the project was used to indicate mastery of 3 distinct LOs. This is not an effective way to understand mastery of the LOs independently of each other. A rubric that provides a score for each LO, then can be used to provide an overall assignment score, would be much more effective for the purposes of LO assessment. The grade on the overall project serves as an indirect measure at best.	Developing

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	Related to the note above, a rubric that would provide data on student mastery of each of these LOs independently would provide much richer and more accurate data. A benchmark for proficiency of students doing a part of an assignment is not a reflection of proficient mastery of a learning outcome.	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	While insightful discussion was provided about the challenges in supporting student learning regarding their research practice, part of the challenge in providing guidance to supporting student learning or improving student weaknesses comes from not having sufficient data upon which to draw these inferences. The assignment choice for assessment is strong, but the evaluation of student mastery could be significantly improved with just a few small adjustments. These data could give much richer insight into student progress and opportunities for faculty to support learning in ways within their control.	Developing

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.