Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16   **Due to your dean by June 1**
                                                                                                                Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: _Human and Environmental Systems_   **Contact Name and Email** _Steve Aldrich (steve.aldrich@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.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)s 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 expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Collect, analyze, interpret, qualitative and quantitative data collected in the field and laboratory	(1) Instructor of ENVI460 assessed student projects for data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Projects must receive a B+ or better grade to demonstrate base proficiency. (2) ENVI460, the department's "culminating experience" course.	Final presentations will be presented by students and show clear evidence of the collection, analysis, and interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data collected in the field and/or laboratory.	6 out of 12 (50%) students received >B on personal final projects, 3 out of 12 students (25%) received >B on group final projects, 100% received an A or better on their final exam, and 9 of 12 (66%) received >B in the course. All students achieved the learning outcome, but four did not do so consistently over the entire term.	(1) Instructor of ENVI460 in collaboration with Assessment Coordinator Aldrich. (2) They were shared with the program faculty through an open forum where faculty could view student presentations and also through the circulation of this report.
2. Comprehend how the environment contributes to the construct of cultures and societies worldwide	(1) Milestone courses. (2) ENVI201, ENVI 205, ENVI 308, ENVI 436, ENVI 440, ENVI 449, ENVI105	A quality grade (B or better) in one of the milestone courses shows a base level of content competency.	Every student achieved the expectation.	(1) Major advisors and/or Assessment Coordinator Aldrich. (2) Circulation of this report.
3. Effectively synthesize and communicate research findings both orally and in writing	(1) Evaluation of final presentations in culminating experience course. (2) ENVI460, final presentations.	Professional national conference-level oral presentation skills in addition to a quality project which met learning outcome 1 (above).	Every student effectively synthesized and communicated research findings orally and in writing according to ENVI460 instructor.	(1) Instructor of ENVI460, Assessment Coordinator, faculty of the HES major. (2) They were shared with the program faculty through an open forum where faculty could view student presentations and also through the circulation of this report.

Part Two
In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

While our overall findings are that the learning outcomes assessed during this cycle are being adequately met, and that students are gaining skills they need to be successful in the job market and/or post-graduate education, we have come to realize a few things about our curriculum as we currently offer it. These realizations come, in at least a small part, from our assessment efforts. First, we would like to make it clear that students very clearly exceed our learning outcomes, and our curriculum does educate competent professionals. However, the Human and Environmental Systems major hides the constituent disciplines (Anthropology and Geography) to some extent, and does not take advantage of the significant opportunity for cross-fertilized academic collaboration. Over the next academic year (2016-2017) we plan a significant curricular overhaul to respond to these issues, and will also be completely rewriting our assessment plan to correspond to that new curriculum.

One goal of a new curriculum and accompanying learning outcomes and assessment plan (which we are currently working on only in concept, rather than specifics) is to integrate assessment activities more directly in our curricular process. As the plan is currently designed there are too many measures and too many assessment-specific (rather than education experience that can contribute to assessment) activities to generate these reports. The reports also rely on the actions of a very few department personnel.

Given the changes likely to be put into place over the 2016-2017 academic year (to be in effect for 2017-2018, hopefully), we will focus assessment efforts for the coming year in two areas: Core courses which all majors in the Department of Earth & Environmental Systems must take in the current curriculum (ENVI130 and ENVI110), and our culminating experience course, ENVI460.

Degree Program: BS in Human and Environmental Systems   Date: 8.22.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	**Level 1 – Developing**	**Level 2 – Mature**	**Level 3 – Exemplary**
1. Student Learning Outcomes	☐ No outcomes are identified. ☐ No Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes were identified. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☒ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☒ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. Two of three are. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				☐ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☒ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☒ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☐ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				students know/can do.
				☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☒ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Some results are provided. ☒ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Results are provided. ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☒ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ? ☒ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ? ☒ These discussions lead to the development of specific,	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.

	about previous results or plans.	☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	relevant plans for improvement. ? ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	☐ Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☒ **Level 1 - Developing**	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS
Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   Two of the three outcomes are clear and measurable (#2 needs a more specific verb than "comprehend"), and they suggest that learning occurs across multiple domains (though this is not clear from the results).

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   Outcomes #1 and #3 are assessed by undefined student "projects" in the capstone course. If these really are "presentations" (c), I would ask whether this is the most reliable way to assess complex research skills. Performance expectations are not specifically identified. What constitutes "clear evidence" and "professional oral presentation skills"?

   Outcome #2 is assessed by grades in milestone courses. This may measure student success, but it does not measure learning: By themselves, grades do not tell you what students know and can do well/less well. That said, it is possible to correlate grades and outcomes. In any case, you can use grades as an indirect measure (though there are better ones, such as focus groups).

3. **Results**
   It is not clear whether students met the requirements for the first outcome; the report indicates they met the others, though no data are provided.

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   At least two faculty members are responsible for collecting and analyzing data associated with outcomes #1 and #3. Are the actual results shared at an open forum, or do you mean that the faculty can view the student artifacts there? Part Two references one key plan to improve the student experience (i.e., revising the curriculum) that will, in turn, result in a new assessment plan.

   In next year's report, please provide more detail to demonstrate that the assessment measures effectively assess the outcomes and result in meaningful information that you can use/are using to improve student learning.

   Thanks!