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: _____Multidisciplinary Studies_____   **Contact Name and Email** __Donna Selman donna.selman@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. Students use proper techniques for the form of communication in which they are engaged.	1.) Assessment of final research paper and presentation. 2) MST 401	Students will earn a minimum rating of "3" (competent) in four categories "content, organization, presentation and technical skills"	All students earned the minimum or above in these categories. (n=3)	Dr. Selman Will share with the MST Faculty at the September 2016 meeting
2. Students understand the various disciplines constituting their major.	1.) "Explain how a set of selected courses from different disciplines contributed to your overall understanding of Society" 2.) Individual Exit Interviews and MST Culminating Project	Individual Exit Interviews: All students must attend and come prepared to discuss a minimum of three courses in different disciplines. MST Culminating Project: The project requires that students include "relevant connections and perspectives across disciplines."	All students attended the interview prepared and were able to discuss what they gained from three disciplines. (n=3)	Dr. Selman Will share with MST faculty at the September meeting Dr. Selman Shared with Faculty via Public Presentation Event in May 2016, on the webpage and will be summarized in the September 2016 meeting
3. Students use different disciplines in conjunction with one another to explore and explain intellectual problems.	1.) Students are asked to demonstrate how specific skill sets from different disciplines contributed to their understanding of a specific problem. 2) Culminating Project: MST 401	Students will earn a minimum of 3 (competent) on all categories: The project shows relevant connections between multidisciplinary experiences, academic course work and career opportunities.	All students earned a minimum of 3 on all categories. (n=3)	Dr. Selman Will share with MST faculty at the September meeting Dr. Selman Shared with Faculty via Public Presentation Event in May 2016, on the webpage and will be summarized in the September 2016 meeting

* See https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf.

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 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).
    e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

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.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Discovery: Student Learning: Our students are well equipped for communicating complex concepts both orally and in writing; they have a good understanding of interdisciplinary work and work best when a climate of mutual support is established. Response: We will continue to offer the MST 401 and the International Studies 490 together in order for students to gain and experience interdisciplinarity in action and to build a climate of support.
Discovery: Curriculum: Providing examples of various forms of final projects is tricky. On the one hand it may serve to stifle creativity but on the other it provides a visual example of successful final projects. Response: We will provide access to exemplary paper and project examples to students. However we will stress that these are not the only avenues to demonstrate competence. We will add access to a variety of technology including Prezi.
http://www.indstate.edu/cas/MultidisciplinaryStudies/multidisciplinary-studies-program/designated-concentration-mst/examples

Discovery: Departmental Processes: The decision to offer the MST 401 and IS 490 jointly was a good one. We will continue this in the future. We will also work to improve attendance at the public viewing of presentations including family members and potential majors.
Discovery: Assessment: Our assessment plan does not directly address career readiness. We do address this in a variety of ways (see portfolio requirement in the Syllabus).
We will add this to our outcomes library in the coming year
Focus for next year:
1) Strengthening Career Readiness with the guidance of the Career Services Center. (outcome to be developed)
2) Student Learning Outcome 3.1: Students acquire problem-solving skills from at least two different disciplines.

Degree Program: <u>BS in Multidisciplinary Studies</u> Date: <u>8.24.16</u>

	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. ☐ 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 about previous results or	☒ 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, relevant plans for improvement.	☐ 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. ☐ Faculty and other important

plans.	☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	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**
   The three learning outcomes assessed this past year generally are clear and measurable, with the exception of two. Why not replace it with some version of this statement from the culminating project description: "Students make relevant connections across the disciplines"? The program's curriculum map—which tracks outcomes in only one course, MST 401—reminded me of its unique "problem": You control little of the curriculum students actually complete. At a minimum, can you add International Studies 490 to the map?

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   The program used four discrete measures to assess students' achievement of the outcomes, including three direct methods (research paper, presentation, culminating project) and an indirect measure, the exit interview. Each is appropriate to its related outcome, though I would appreciate more detail about the culminating project. Is it an individual or group project? What are its requirements?

3. **Results**
   Results are positive though the N's are quite small. Is it safe to assume you track the results over time to ensure their validity?

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   Because the program is small and assessment is localized in just one course, a single faculty member is responsible for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data. The latter occurs regularly—and I am pleased to see that it will include the web site. Part Two offers a good general discussion of assessment-related (and other) discoveries and plans, including the development of a career readiness outcome. In next year's report, please provide more specific information about student learning: What do students know and do well (and less well)? Overall, are they achieving program outcomes? Does learning continuously improve? Are students successful ultimately?

   Thanks for sharing this information about your program's student learning assessment efforts!