

Degree Program Name: Construction Management **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Lee.Ellingson@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 One: Summary of Assessment Activities

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program’s faculty?</p>
<p>Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline</p>	<p>Closing a traverse and grid leveling assignments. CNST 420, Construction Surveying</p>	<p>Average grade must be 75/100 or better.</p>	<p>Closing a traverse-83; grid leveling-85. Outcome achieved.</p>	<p>Brent MacDonald. The construction faculty reviewed the student work on November 15, 2016, and the results were recorded in Minutes 7.</p>
<p>Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline</p>	<p>Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.</p>	<p>Average grade must be 75/100 or better.</p>	<p>55/100 Outcome not achieved.</p>	<p>Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.</p>
<p>Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline</p>	<p>The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.</p>	<p>A weighted average of 3.00 or better.</p>	<p>3.18 Outcome achieved.</p>	<p>Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.</p>
<p>Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline</p>	<p>Students were required to present a proposal to acquire work from a client. The proposal had to be as realistic as possible. CNST 480, Construction Capstone. A jury from the Advisory Board assessed the presentations</p>	<p>Average grade must be 75/100 or better.</p>	<p>Class average was 78. Outcome achieved. McNabb and Bawinkel will work together to increase the quality of the oral presentations. Possibilities include a preliminary presentation and capturing the presentations with video.</p>	<p>Donald McNabb. The construction faculty reviewed the written part of the proposal and the rubrics used to grade the oral presentations on November 15, 2016. The results were recorded in Minutes 7.</p>
<p>Create oral presentations</p>	<p>Students in CNST 480,</p>	<p>Average grade must be 75/100</p>	<p>80/100</p>	<p>Donald McNabb gives the test;</p>

appropriate to the construction discipline	Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	or better.	Outcome achieved.	Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline	The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	A weighted average of 3.00 or better.	3.18 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.
Create a construction project safety plan	Students were required to create a job-specific safety plan. The job was the renovation of the boiler plant at Rose Hullman. CNST 330, Construction Accounting, Finance, and Safety.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	Class average was 86. Outcome achieved.	Lee Ellingson presented typical student work and the assignment instructions to the construction faculty on November 15, 2016. The results were recorded in Minutes 7.
Create a construction project safety plan	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	57/100 Outcome not achieved.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Create a construction project safety plan	The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	A weighted average of 3.00 or better.	3.06 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.
Create construction project cost estimates	In CNST 480, Construction Capstone, students were required to create a proposal for a construction project which included a cost estimate.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	Class average was 78. Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb. The construction faculty reviewed the student work on November 15, 2016, and the results were recorded in Minutes 7.
Create construction project cost estimates	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	74/100 Outcome not achieved but may be within acceptable tolerance.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Create construction project cost	The Senior Survey is a self-	A weighted average of 3.00 or	3.47	Donald McNabb, the instructor

estimates	assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	better.	Outcome achieved.	for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.
Create construction project schedules	Students were required to create a project schedule using appropriate software. Students were then required to “crash” the schedule to meet new conditions.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	Class average was 91. Outcome achieved.	William Baker. The construction faculty reviewed the student work for appropriateness and quality on December 6, 2016. The results were recorded in Minutes 8.
Create construction project schedules	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	56/100 Outcome not achieved.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Create construction project schedules	The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	A weighted average of 3.00 or better.	3.35 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.
Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles	Students were required to write two papers. Paper 1 required them to create an ethical argument based on a case study; Paper 2 required them to evaluate another student’s argument. Online discussions required students to evaluate the arguments of classmates. CNST 101, Ethics and Construction.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	Paper 1: 77 Paper 2: 84 Discussions: 74 Outcome achieved The instructor may improve the discussions by providing more examples of good work.	Lee Ellingson provided instructions and grading rubrics. The construction faculty reviewed examples of student work on March 8, 2017. The results were recorded in Minutes 12.
Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	94/100 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Analyze professional decisions	The Senior Survey is a self-	A weighted average of 3.00 or	3.53	Donald McNabb, the instructor

based on ethical principles	assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	better.	Outcome achieved.	for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.
Analyze construction documents for planning and management of construction processes	In CNST 480, Construction Capstone, students were required to create a bid proposal for a real project. The written proposal was presented in a binder.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	It was not clear to faculty what documents should be used for this assessment. It was agreed that in future project estimates and schedules would be appropriate.	Donald McNabb Provided examples of student work. Results were indecisive but still recorded on March 8, 2017 in Minutes 12.
Analyze construction documents for planning and management of construction processes	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	89/100 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Analyze construction documents for planning and management of construction processes	The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	A weighted average of 3.00 or better.	3.41 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.
Analyze methods, materials, and equipment used to construct projects	In CNST 111, Construction Methods, Materials, and Equipment, students were required to take quizzes and create a presentation.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	Presentation: 74 Quiz 1: 74 Quiz 2: 82 The presentation and Quiz 1 were one point below the criteria.	William Baker. The construction faculty reviewed the student work on March 29, 2017. The results were recorded in Minutes 13.
Analyze methods, materials, and equipment used to construct projects	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	74/100 Outcome not achieved but may be within acceptable tolerance.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Analyze methods, materials, and equipment used to construct projects	The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4).	A weighted average of 3.00 or better.	3.53 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The

	The survey is administered in CNST 480.			report was shared with all faculty.
Apply construction management skills as an effective member of a multi-disciplinary team	Student work from CNST 480, Construction Capstone was scheduled to be reviewed; however, the definition of "multidisciplinary team" was not clear to faculty.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	No student assessments were available.	Donald McNabb. Faculty discussed the outcome on March 8, 2017. The results were recorded in Minutes 12.
Apply construction management skills as an effective member of a multi-disciplinary team	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	94/100 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Apply construction management skills as an effective member of a multi-disciplinary team	The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	A weighted average of 3.00 or better.	3.24 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.
Apply electronic-based technology to manage the construction process	CNST 304, Construction Scheduling. One assignment required the students to create a schedule using MS Project; The other assignment required the students to crash (shorten) the schedule and level resources.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	Project Schedule: 75 Crash Schedule: 82 Outcome achieved.	William Baker. Faculty reviewed the grades and assignments on March 29, 2017, and the results were recorded in Minutes 13.
Apply electronic-based technology to manage the construction process	Students in CNST 480, Construction Capstone, are given a multiple-choice test in Blackboard with questions addressing each learning outcome.	Average grade must be 75/100 or better.	63/100 Outcome not achieved.	Donald McNabb gives the test; Lee Ellingson analyzes the results, compiles a report, and shares with faculty.
Apply electronic-based technology to manage the construction process	The Senior Survey is a self-assessment based on a Likert scale. The CM Program prepared you to (Learning Outcomes): Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4). The survey is administered in CNST 480.	A weighted average of 3.00 or better.	3.24 Outcome achieved.	Donald McNabb, the instructor for CNST 480, Construction Capstone, collected the surveys. Lee Ellingson calculated the results and typed student comments in a report. The report was shared with all faculty.

* 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 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”).
- 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: Engagement and 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) the changes you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

Please provide this report to your dean as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.

Discoveries

Students *believe* they are learning the twenty outcomes. This statement is based on the Senior Survey that students submitted. The survey was based on a Likert scale with the following values: Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2), and Strongly Disagree (1). Eighteen students submitted the survey for the academic year. The average score for all 18 outcomes was 3.27, which is between agree and strongly agree. The lowest score was 3.06 for “Create a construction project safety plan” and “Understand construction risk management.” The highest score was 3.47 for “Create construction project cost estimates.” In the Questions and Comments section, students agreed that learning software applications that allowed them to make estimates, schedules, and BIM models were their favorite activities. This is probably because they can readily see how the applications will help them in industry. In general, they had praise for the program, but would like to see more blueprint reading, hands-on activities, and field trips.

The Senior Exit exam was administered for the first time this spring in the capstone course. Students scored 75 or higher on the following SLOs: 2, 6, 7, 9, and 14. SLOs 4 and 8 scored 74, which is probably within statistical variance of 75. Therefore, SLOs 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 need improvement. The average score for all 20 SLOs was 65, ten points below the established criteria of 75.

Using Advisory Board members to assess the capstone projects was well received by both faculty and students.

Using the Column Statistics feature in Blackboard greatly facilitates getting reliable data for assessment review.

Changes and Improvements

The CM faculty had an all-day workshop on May 6 to validate or revise the Curriculum Map and course syllabi. This was especially helpful in part due to two new faculty. Some changes were made to the Map and Syllabi based on this review. The old and new Curriculum Map are available for review. Also, SLO binders were updated with examples of student work and grade statistics for each assignment used to assess the SLOs.

Good exams are difficult to create. The CM faculty will continue to review the Senior Exit Exam questions to verify if the questions are actually assessing what is being taught in the CM courses. The Exit Exam is valuable because it is a direct measure of student learning; however, the questions need to accurately measure what is being taught.

The Senior Survey will be made a requirement for the capstone course to ensure student participation.

The instructor for the capstone course will look for better rubrics to assess the written and oral presentations. The Advisory Board members generally had praise for the students, but the letter grades derived from the rubrics were low. The rubrics need to be improved. McNabb and Bawinkel will work together to improve the oral presentations. Possible actions include requiring a preliminary presentation with video reviews. McNabb and Bawinkel will continue to develop ways and means to assess online students.

L. Ellingson will consider revising the WIKI assignment in CNST 101. Students are somewhat bewildered about how to use WIKIs, even though they are familiar with Wikipedia.

L. Ellingson will propose revising CNST 213 to incorporate electrical systems. This is currently (pardon the pun) being taught in another department, which makes it difficult to get complete cooperation in outcomes assessment.

Looking Ahead

Fall 2017

- Apply basic surveying techniques for construction layout and control.
- Understand different methods of project delivery and the roles and responsibilities of all constituencies involved in the design and construction process.
- Understand construction risk management.
- Understand construction accounting and cost control.
- Understand construction quality assurance and control.

Spring 2018

- Understand construction project control processes.
- Understand the legal implications of contract, common, and regulatory law to manage a construction project.
- Understand the basic principles of sustainable construction.
- Understand the basic principles of structural behavior.
- Understand the basic principles of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BS in Construction Management

Date: 11.03.17

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

				<p>extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p>

				<p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

				<input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

This program has a solid assessment plan in place and consistently follows through with it. Outcomes are clear and measurable (and reviewed regularly). Multiple measures—tests, projects, presentations, surveys--are in place to assess them and to ensure that students have a variety of means to demonstrate their knowledge and skills. In some cases, the alignment between the measures and outcomes isn't clear (for example, how does the traverse and grid leveling assignment demonstrate written communication skills?). Also, results are based on grades, and I still would like to see evidence that you are assessing student achievement, not just grading it. I know you use rubrics: Are they calibrated to specific outcomes and expectations? Are exam questions keyed to important concepts and outcomes, so that you can tell at a glance what students know/don't know?

Part Two provides excellent details about the new student survey. I would love to see more information about other outcomes students performed less well in (though you address these to some extent in Part One, noting—for example—that you may try to improve students' ethical decision making by offering more good examples). The program's director is diligent about sharing assessment results and including both the larger faculty and the advisory in conversations about student learning.

Thank you for sharing your Student Learning Summary Report!

