

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: ___Biology BS & MLS___ **Contact Name and Email** ___Donna Selman and Joy O’Keefe, Joy.OKeefe@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

<p>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.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(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?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</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>SL0#1 Explain & illustrate fundamental concepts in Biology (for AY16–17)</p>	<p>1) Administered a 78 question test we developed based on questions used in Core Biology classes (101, 102, 330, 350, 374, 380). Thirty students took this exam. 2) We gave students extra credit to complete this exam. We intend to make it a regular requirement of the 490 seminar course, but had not instituted this by Spring 2017.</p>	<p>We set the expectation that students should earn a B- (≥80%) on this exam in order for us to say we have achieved this outcome. We recognize this is a relatively high expectation.</p>	<p>Of the 30 students who took the exam, the mean score was 48.33%. Scores ranged from 32% to 64%. We broke the scores down by classes. For questions related to 101 & 102 (freshmen-level), students earned 53–56%. For 300-level core classes, students earned 39–51%.</p>	<p>1) Undergrad Affairs Committe (Dannelly, Mitchell, O’Keefe, Scwab, Steding) 2) Distributed to faculty via email. Will discuss at Fall 2017 faculty meeting.</p>

Summary

1) discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself

*Students retain 50% or less of the material from core classes. More from 100-level than 300-level.

*There is little difference in their retention of material from the four 300-level classes, which suggests standards are similar across these courses. *We still need to figure out a way to make the test a requirement, but we have done a good job of recruiting seniors to take the test (27 of 49 graduates and 3 of 4 MLS students took the test in Sp17).

*We want to reevaluate which SLOs we assess in each period.

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

*Instructors will review performance by question to see if any changes are needed for how courses are taught. *No changes needed to the curriculum

3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year

*We would like to continue assessing SLO#1 with the Biology Major's Core Assessment Exam so that we can gather a larger dataset, compare results across years, and further refine our assessment tool. Also, we would like to discuss as a faculty which other SLOs might be best to assess in the future.

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

Degree Program: Biology BS & MLS Date: 11.16.17

	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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map

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

			keys, etc.) were provided.	<p>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>
3. Results	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is</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</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance 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. Will be? <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. Will do so? <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. General but relevant	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and

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

Thank you for submitting your 2017 Student Learning Summary Report!

Developing your own comprehensive exam for graduating students is a cost-effective way of collecting information about what students know (if not what they can do), and I am pleased that you intend to continue to refine it. As you do so, please ensure that you have keyed exam questions to the outcomes they relate to, so that you can tell easily which outcomes students are most and least proficient in. Consider, too, that volunteer students may not be representative of the overall cohort, which means that results (good or bad) may not truly reflect graduates' knowledge. Thus I concur with your goal of finding a way to make the test a requirement for all students. (If you are concerned about low scores affecting their grades, consider an alternate testing scenario. For example, test students individually and record the scores for assessment purposes. Then put them into groups of students with different levels of abilities, and let them take the test as a group. Count this score as their grade.) Every few years, you still may want to have seniors complete the Major Field Test just so that you can validate results from the "homegrown" exam. One more thing: Have you considered that you might want to deliver the exam to sophomores or juniors? This might help students retain what they learned in the 100-level courses, and it also would give you some information about whether or not student performance improves as they move through the major.

Next year, please separate results for the Biology and MLS students so that you have more pertinent information to guide your discussions about student learning.