

College of Arts and Sciences 2016-2017

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|--------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Program - Art Education - BFA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will express their ideas, feelings, and experiences by creating authentic art. | Students enrolled in ART 103: Design 1, ART 104: Design II, ART 105: Drawing I, ART 106: Drawing II, ART 195: Computers in Art, will submit examples of artwork including one independent work, a sketchbook, and a reflection paper to be evaluated using the Foundation Portfolio Review Rubric for Art Education majors only. Art Education faculty will carry out assessment process. | Students will score "meets expectations" 5 times out of the 7 sections on the Foundation Portfolio Review Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 3 Students Total: Student A: 3 Exceeds Expectations, 3 Meets Expectations, 1 Needs Improvement. Student B: 5 Exceeds Expectations, 2 Meets Expectations, 0 Needs Improvement. Student C: 3 Exceeds Expectations, 4 Meets Expectations, 0 Needs Improvement. | This was a successful rubric. Repeat. |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Students will express their ideas, feelings, and experiences by creating art as a reflective exercise to further enhance their art teaching. | Students enrolled in ART 240 will be given an Exit Survey to determine growth in the satisfaction of the Art Education program, and Art Education faculty will review and analyze the survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | 75% of participating ART 240 students will report that they were "satisfied" on the Exit Survey for Art Education majors. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 4 Students Total: Student A: 2 responses of "Yes, to a great extent"; 4 responses of "Yes, to a good extent, 0 responses of "Yes, somewhat"; and 0 responses of "No, not at all." Student B: 0 responses of "Yes, to a great extent"; 6 responses of "Yes, to a good extent"; 0 responses of "Yes, somewhat"; and 0 responses of "No, not at all." Student D: 0 responses of "Yes, to a great extent"; 6 responses of "Yes, | This was a successful survey. Repeat. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Students will express their ideas, feelings, and experiences by creating art as a reflective exercise to further enhance their art teaching. | Students enrolled in ART 240 will be given an Exit Survey to determine growth in the satisfaction of the Art Education program, and Art Education faculty will review and analyze the survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | 75% of participating ART 240 students will report that they were "satisfied" on the Exit Survey for Art Education majors. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | to a good extent"; 0 responses of "Yes, somewhat"; and 0 responses of "No, not at all." Student E: 6 responses of "Yes, to a great extent"; 0 responses of "Yes, to a good extent"; 0 responses of "Yes, somewhat"; and 0 responses of "No, not at all." | This was a successful survey. Repeat. |
| | | | Students participating in ART 240: Introduction to Art Education will be given a Written Art Lesson Assignment, and Art Education faculty will assess the assignment using the Written Art Lesson Rubric. | Students will have an average score of at least a 2 or higher on a 0-4 scale on the Written Art Lesson Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 4 Students Total (Note: 2 Students are Art Education Majors: Student A and Student B): Student A: Score 4 on Written Art Lesson Student B: Score 4 on Written Art Lesson Student D: Score 4 on Written Art Lesson Student E: Score 4 on Written Art Lesson | This was very successful. The written art lesson was designed well as a group assignment, and for the first time since I taught this course it was implemented as an art lesson taught to children at a non-profit arts organization. |
| | 3.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will develop divergent thinking skills such as problem solving, critical thinking, and risk taking when engaging in the process of art making, dialoguing about works of art, and writing about the visual arts. | Students participating in ART 240: Introduction to Art Education will be given What Do the Visual Arts Mean In My Life? Assignment, and Art Education faculty will assess the assignment using the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric. | Students will have an average score of at least a 2 or higher on a 0-4 scale on the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric for the "What Do the Visual Arts Mean In My Life?" assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 4 Students Total: Student A scored 4. Student B scored 4. Student D scored 3. Student E scored 4. | This was a successful assignment. Repeat. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|--|---|------------------|--------------|--|--|
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Students will gain knowledge and understanding of the scholarship that support contemporary Art Education issues. | Students enrolled in ART 240: Introduction to Art Education will be given Critique Paper Assignment, and Art Education faculty will assess the assignment using the Critique Paper Rubric. | Students will have an average score of at least a 2 or higher on a 0-4 scale on the Critique Paper Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 4 Students Total: Student A scored 4. Student B scored 4. Student D scored 3. Student E scored 3. | This was a successful assignment in evaluating the reported necessary skills acquisitions. Repeat. |
| | 5.1 (SLO) | Students will develop future art education leadership qualities such as respect diversity including gender, culture, race, and disability at the school and community service levels. | Students enrolled in ART 340 will be given an Exit Survey to determine growth in the satisfaction of the Art Education program, and Art Education faculty will review and analyze the survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | 75% of participating ART 340 students will report that they were "satisfied" on the Exit Survey for Art Education majors. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 2 Students Total: Student F: 4 responses "Yes, to a great extent," 2 responses "Yes, to a good extent," 0 responses "Yes, somewhat," and 0 responses "No, not at all." Student G: 5 responses "Yes, to a great extent," 1 response "Yes, to a good extent," 0 responses "Yes, somewhat," and 0 responses "No, not at all." | This was a successful survey. Repeat. |
| | | | Students enrolled in ART 340: Art Education Methods and Materials will be given Contextual Factor Paper, and Art Education faculty assess the assignment using the Contextual Factor Paper Rubric. | Students will have an average score of at least a 2 or higher on a 0-4 scale on the Contextual Factor Paper Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 2 Students: Student F scored 4. Student G scored 4. | This was a successful assignment. Repeat. |
| | 6.1 (SLO) | Students will achieve competence in teaching art using a student-centered approach to a | Students enrolled in ED 407 (03): Internship will be given the Art | Students will have an average score of at least a 2 or higher on a 0-4 scale on the Art | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | I have not taught this course yet. I plan to do so in Fall 2017 semester. | Will assess Fall 2017. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|---------------------|---|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 6.1 (SLO) | range of populations including toddlers, youth, adolescents, adults, older persons, and those with disabilities. | Teacher Portfolio assignment, and Art Education faculty will assess the assignment using the Art Teacher Portfolio Rubric. | Teacher Portfolio Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | I have not taught this course yet. I plan to do so in Fall 2017 semester. | Will assess Fall 2017. |
| | | | Students will take the Praxis Subject Test for Art to assess content knowledge of in the field of art education. | 75% of participating students will earn a passing score on Praxis Subject Test for Art. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | No students have taken this test yet. | At least one student will study for this test over the summer 2017. |
| | 7.1 (SAO & PO 2.c.) | Students will prepare for a position as an art educator at a public school or private school, art museum, or community organization. | Student participating in ED 407 (03): Internship will be given the assignment Resume with Rubric. Art Education faculty will carry out assessment process. | Students will have an average score of at least a 2 or higher on a 0-3 scale on the Resume Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | I have not taught this course yet. I plan to do so in Fall 2017 semester. | Will assess Fall 2017. |
| Program - Biology (including Minor and Secondary Education Certification) - BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | The student will accurately interpret and draw conclusions from data presented in tables and graphs in scientific articles to show they can "critically evaluate existing knowledge." | Work done by students in this junior-level class (BSB 310) will be assessed by faculty using departmental rubrics created for this learning outcome. | More than 75% of the students in BSB 310 General Ecology will score satisfactory or better (as measured by the departmental assessment rubric) on assignments requiring graph interpretation and concept mapping of a scientific article. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | This activity was not assessed this year. | Even though we neglected to assess this activity this year, the biology unit will continue to incorporate exercises into their courses that analyse and interpret figures from the scientific literature. The more students are exposed to these kinds of exercises, the better they get at them. |
| | | | Work done by students in this sophomore-level class (BSB 230) will be assessed by faculty using departmental rubrics created for this learning outcome. | More than 75% of the students in BSB 230 General Genetics will score satisfactory or better (as measured by the departmental assessment rubric) in an assignment question interpreting a single table or figure taken from a scientific | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Target was NOT met. Only 71% (20/28) of the Fall 2016 BSB 230 students scored satisfactory or better on the rubric. 18% (5/28) of the students scored proficient; 54% (15/28) scored | The achievement in this assessed activity has been trending consistently upwards over the past four years. The biology unit will continue to incorporate exercises into their courses that analyse and interpret figures from the scientific literature. The more students are exposed to these kinds of exercises, the better they get at them. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | Work done by students in this sophomore-level class (BSB 230) will be assessed by faculty using departmental rubrics created for this learning outcome. | paper. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | satisfactory; 28% (8/28) scored unsatisfactory. | The achievement in this assessed activity has been trending consistently upwards over the past four years. The biology unit will continue to incorporate exercises into their courses that analyse and interpret figures from the scientific literature. The more students are exposed to these kinds of exercises, the better they get at them. |
| | 1.2 (GEO 4.c.) | The student will apply the scientific method to a research question. This reflects the General Education Goal 4.c "To demonstrate understanding of self, society, and the natural world, students will demonstrate the ability to apply the scientific method to solve problems." It also reflects the Biology program's mission to develop students with "the ability to apply the process of science", as stated in the Biology Mission Statement above. | Work done by students in the biology capstone course will be assessed by faculty using the AAC&U VALUE Inquiry & Analysis rubric. | Students in BS 400 Senior Seminar will average "2.5" or higher on the 0-4 scale of the VALUE Inquiry & Assessment rubric used to evaluate a capstone project in which each students selects a published journal article and writes a research proposal based on the research in the article. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Target met. Student average on the VALUE Inquiry & Assessment rubric was 2.8/4. Eleven out of 16 students scored 3 or higher. | This is the first year we are assessing this goal. We met the target, but we don't know yet how consistent this will type of result will be. The biology unit has been incorporating more exercises into their courses that involve analyzing and interpreting figures and graphs from the scientific literature. The next step in these types of exercises is to have the students work on the bigger picture of understanding design and rationales behind the experiments. We will start to incorporate those types of exercises into our courses. |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | The student will apply concepts from previous courses to current courses. | Work done by students in BSB 310, typically taken in the 4th year, will be assessed by faculty using departmental rubrics created for this learning outcome. | More than 75% of the students in BSB 310 General Ecology will score satisfactory or better (as measured by the departmental assessment rubric) on activities requiring the application of knowledge gained in first-year general biology and quantitative chemistry courses. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Target met. 100% of students (19/19) scored satisfactory or better on the assessed activity. 21% were scored proficient (4/19); 89% were scored satisfactory (15/19); and 0% were scored unsatisfactory. | The Biology unit will continue to spend time, in as many classes as possible, making connections between new material and material previously learned in other courses. When we make explicit connections, students seem to understand those connections. We do need to work on developing in the students the ability to make those connections on their own without having it pointed out before hand that they are there to be found. |
| | | | Work done by | More than 75% of the | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Target was met. | The Biology unit will continue to |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | students in BSB 346, typically taken in the 2nd or 3rd year, will be assessed by faculty using departmental rubrics created for this learning outcome. | students in BSB 346 Evolutionary Biology will score satisfactory or better (as measured by the departmental assessment rubric) on an exam question that relates DNA sequence changes to evolutionary relationships between organisms. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 87% of the students (21/28) in BSB 346 Evolutionary Biology scored satisfactory or better on the assessed activity.29% (7/24) scored Proficient, 58% (14/24) scored Satisfactory, and 13% (3/24) scored Unsatisfactory. | spend time, in as many classes as possible, making connections between new material and material previously learned in other courses. When we make explicit connections, students seem to understand those connections. We do need to work on developing in the students the ability to make those connections on their own without having it pointed out before hand that they are there to be found. |
| | 2.2 (SAO) | In keeping with the University Mission to provide “a high-quality undergraduate education” and in keeping with the Biology program goal of having students understand “material across disciplines,” the student will learn the concepts covered by a commercial, nationally-administered Major Fields Test in biology, taken in their final semester before graduation. | All Biology majors will, as a requirement for graduation, take a nationally-administered Major Fields Test in biology from ETS in Princeton, NJ, in their last semester of study. The tests will be graded by ETS and returned along with information comparing scores to test-takers at other 4-year institutions nation-wide. ETS will provide information about each student’s percentile ranking for the test. | More than 50% of the students taking the Major Fields Test will score above the 50th percentile ranking when comparing their performance to those of students across the nation taking the same test in the same year. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Target not met. Only 12% of the students (2/17) scored above the 50th percentile ranking in the assessed activity. | <p>We have been falling short of this assessment goal for each of the last ten years. This year, we dropped to a slightly lower percentage making the goal than last year, but the average percentile for the Major Fields Test did rise from 17th to 25th, which is something of a positive sign.</p> <p>The same issues as in previous years seem to be in play.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Students are not doing a good job of studying for retention of the material. 2. Instructors are not doing a good job of reinforcing concepts seen in previous courses or making connections to previous courses' concepts. <p>We will continue to work on inculcating in students more efficient learning techniques by devoting class time to reviewing effective study strategies for material just covered in the course.</p> <p>We will continue to try to point out connections between new material and material previously learned in</p> |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|--|--|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 2.2 (SAO) | In keeping with the University Mission to provide “a high-quality undergraduate education” and in keeping with the Biology program goal of having students understand “material across disciplines,” the student will learn the concepts covered by a commercial, nationally-administered Major Fields Test in biology, taken in their final semester before graduation. | All Biology majors will, as a requirement for graduation, take a nationally-administered Major Fields Test in biology from ETS in Princeton, NJ, in their last semester of study. The tests will be graded by ETS and returned along with information comparing scores to test-takers at other 4-year institutions nation-wide. ETS will provide information about each student’s percentile ranking for the test. | More than 50% of the students taking the Major Fields Test will score above the 50th percentile ranking when comparing their performance to those of students across the nation taking the same test in the same year. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Target not met. Only 12% of the students (2/17) scored above the 50th percentile ranking in the assessed activity. | other courses. People do not retain information they do not use. They more students are expected to re-teach themselves concepts encountered previously, the more they will reinforce previous learning. |
| | 2.3 (PO 2.d.) | In keeping with the University Strategic Goal 2.d of promoting “regional stewardship through partnerships across campus and across the region by forging meaningful and engaged partnerships that provide real-life experiences for students”, the student will participate in community service opportunities while enrolled in the department. | All graduating Biology seniors will be given a Survey as part of a required Exit Interview with the Department Chair. One question on that survey will ask students to enumerate the types of community service activities they have participated in while an MUW undergraduate. Faculty will review and analyze the survey results. | More than 75% of the students participating in the Exit Interview Survey will have participated in at least two different types of community service activities. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Target was not met. Only 12% (2/17) of the surveyed students indicated they had participated in at least two different types of community service activities. However, 72% (12/17) indicated they had participated in one type of community service activity. Of the ones who indicated only one type of community service activity, the vast majority indicated it was off-campus community | Large numbers of students are reporting getting involved with off-campus community service activities, but very few are doing other types of community service. There are plenty of opportunities for students to do department-based community service, including assisting with Science Bowl, helping with high school science fairs, and others. The biology unit will try to do a better job recruiting students to participate in these departmental activities. We will do a more thorough job publicizing the opportunities, and try more often to work through the students' social clubs to get clusters of students participating in specific events. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|--|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 2.3 (PO 2.d.) | In keeping with the University Strategic Goal 2.d of promoting “regional stewardship through partnerships across campus and across the region by forging meaningful and engaged partnerships that provide real-life experiences for students”, the student will participate in community service opportunities while enrolled in the department. | All graduating Biology seniors will be given a Survey as part of a required Exit Interview with the Department Chair. One question on that survey will ask students to enumerate the types of community service activities they have participated in while an MUW undergraduate. Faculty will review and analyze the survey results. | More than 75% of the students participating in the Exit Interview Survey will have participated in at least two different types of community service activities. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | service. | Large numbers of students are reporting getting involved with off-campus community service activities, but very few are doing other types of community service. There are plenty of opportunities for students to do department-based community service, including assisting with Science Bowl, helping with high school science fairs, and others. The biology unit will try to do a better job recruiting students to participate in these departmental activities. We will do a more thorough job publicizing the opportunities, and try more often to work through the students' social clubs to get clusters of students participating in specific events. |
| Program - Chemistry (including Minor) - BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 3.a.) | The student will (TSW) successfully execute problem-solving related to basic stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics. | Stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics questions from quizzes and exams in PSC 111 will be evaluated by faculty using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | The average score of PSC 111 students should be at least a “3” on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric in performing calculations and answering questions related to basic stoichiometry. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 139 PSC 111 students across six lecture sections and two semesters (5 sections in fall 2016, 1 section in spring 17) were assessed on their knowledge of basic stoichiometry and the relevant calculations. Stoichiometry questions and calculations (from several quizzes and exams) were evaluated using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE rubric. The average rubric score of the 139 students evaluated was "3" with the following | The implementation of Supplemental Instruction (SI) into all face-to-face sections of PSC 111 lecture has led to an improvement in the students' understanding of the basic concepts of stoichiometry and its relevant calculations. SI peer tutors meet with students 1-2 times per week as a group and individually as needed. In 2015-16 only one section of PSC 111 lecture utilized SI. The scores in that section improved, and now that all face-to-face PSC 111 lecture sections have implemented SI, there is an improvement across the board. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| Program - Chemistry (including Minor) - BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 3.a.) | The student will (TSW) successfully execute problem-solving related to basic stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics. | Stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics questions from quizzes and exams in PSC 111 will be evaluated by faculty using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | The average score of PSC 111 students should be at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric in performing calculations and answering questions related to basic stoichiometry. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | breakdown (37 students, score = 1; 20 students, score = 2; 25 students, score = 3; 57 students, score = 4). Target was achieved. | The implementation of Supplemental Instruction (SI) into all face-to-face sections of PSC 111 lecture has led to an improvement in the students' understanding of the basic concepts of stoichiometry and its relevant calculations. SI peer tutors meet with students 1-2 times per week as a group and individually as needed. In 2015-16 only one section of PSC 111 lecture utilized SI. The scores in that section improved, and now that all face-to-face PSC 111 lecture sections have implemented SI, there is an improvement across the board. |
| | | | Stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics questions from quizzes and exams in PSC 112 will be evaluated by faculty using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | The average score of PSC 112 students should be at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric in performing calculations and answering questions related to equilibrium. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 50 PSC 112 students across two lecture sections were assessed on their knowledge of the basic concepts of equilibrium and the relevant calculations. Conceptual questions and calculations on equilibrium (from several quizzes and exams) were evaluated using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE rubric. The average rubric score of the 50 students evaluated was "3" with the following breakdown (7 students, score = 1; 12 students, score = 2; 11 students, score = 3; 20 | After the failure to meet the this target last year (2015-16), it was decided that faculty would focus more on the basic concepts and calculations of equilibrium instead of its specific applications in chemical reactions. By doing this, faculty were able to dedicate more time to the basic concepts. This strategy appears to have worked in that the target was met. Faculty will continue to stress the basic and general concepts and calculations involved with equilibrium. If it appears that that the target is consistently reached (and exceeded) for several cycles, then faculty might consider assessing student knowledge of specific applications of equilibrium also. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | | | Stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics questions from quizzes and exams in PSC 112 will be evaluated by faculty using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | The average score of PSC 112 students should be at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric in performing calculations and answering questions related to equilibrium. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | students, score = 4). Target was achieved. | After the failure to meet the this target last year (2015-16), it was decided that faculty would focus more on the basic concepts and calculations of equilibrium instead of its specific applications in chemical reactions. By doing this, faculty were able to dedicate more time to the basic concepts. This strategy appears to have worked in that the target was met. Faculty will continue to stress the basic and general concepts and calculations involved with equilibrium. If it appears that that the target is consistently reached (and exceeded) for several cycles, then faculty might consider assessing student knowledge of specific applications of equilibrium also. |
| | | | Stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics questions from quizzes and exams in PSC 450/451 will be evaluated by faculty using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | The average score of PSC 450/451 students should be at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric in performing calculations and answering questions related to thermodynamics/quantum mechanics. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 3 PSC 450/451 students across two semesters were assessed on their knowledge of thermodynamics and quantum mechanics. Conceptual questions and calculations from several quizzes and exams were evaluated using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE rubric. The average rubric score of the 3 students evaluated was "3". The breakdown is as follows (Thermodynamics: 1 student, score = 1; 2 students, score = 4) | PSC 450/451 is on a two year rotation. So these courses, and this assessment, will not be a part of the 2017-18 SMART plan. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | Stoichiometry, equilibrium, and thermodynamics/quantum mechanics questions from quizzes and exams in PSC 450/451 will be evaluated by faculty using the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | The average score of PSC 450/451 students should be at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric in performing calculations and answering questions related to thermodynamics/quantum mechanics. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | (Quantum mechanics: 1 student, score = 1; 1 student, score = 2; 1 student, score = 4). Target was achieved. | PSC 450/451 is on a two year rotation. So these courses, and this assessment, will not be a part of the 2017-18 SMART plan. |
| | 1.2 (SLO) | TSW exhibit effective written communication in the areas of inorganic and analytical chemistry. | Formal lab reports will be evaluated in PSC 112L by faculty using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. | 75% of PSC 112 students should score at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric in writing a formal lab report. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 49 PSC 112L students across three lab sections were assessed on their written communication using two formal lab reports. Lab reports were evaluated using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric. 82% of PSC 112L students scored at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric (49 students evaluated on two lab reports; 1 at level 0, 6 at level 1, 2 at level 2, 8 at level 3, 32 at level 4). Target was achieved. | Students are given a detailed description of the sections that must be included in the lab reports. They are also allowed to write two drafts of the first lab report. Upon reading the first draft, the professor provides extensive feedback to aid the student in writing the second draft. While there is only one draft allowed for the second lab report, the students are provided with extensive assistance from the professor. Multiple drafts of the first lab report and extensive assistance with the second lab report allow the students to meet the target. |
| | 1.3 (SLO) | TSW demonstrate competency in both theoretical and practical aspects of instrumentation and | Qualitative and quantitative questions (quizzes, exams, assignments) related to | 75% of PSC 211/212 students should be at the satisfactory level (70%) or higher in answering questions | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Students who obtained 90% or more of the points were rated "proficient". | The Achievement Target has been established as "75% of students at the satisfactory level or above" for the past few assessment cycles. This target is usually met; however, |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1.3 (SLO) | analytical techniques. | instrumentation will be evaluated by faculty. | and performing calculations related to instrumentation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | <p>Students who obtained between 70 and 89% of the points were rated "satisfactory". Students who obtained less than 70% of the points were rated "unsatisfactory".</p> <p>74% of PSC 211 students (23 students evaluated on an exam; 1 at unsatisfactory, 11 at satisfactory, 6 at proficient) scored at the satisfactory level (70%) or higher in answering questions related to instrumentation. Target of 75% was not achieved.</p> | <p>in 2016-17 the target was not met. Faculty believe that this result is an anomaly that is due to a lack of student preparation. Usually the students are introduced to and quizzed on structure and mechanism before the actual assessment is done, which is beneficial because it allows students to identify and correct their weaknesses before the actual evaluation. This year, unfortunately, due to scheduling, students were not quizzed on the material before the assessment. The students were not able to identify and correct their weaknesses before being evaluated. Faculty are hopeful that issues with scheduling will not arise next year so that students have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with these important concepts before being assessed.</p> |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | TSW recognize and interpret structure, reactions, mechanisms, and synthesis of organic compounds. | Questions related to reactions and synthesis from quizzes and exams in PSC 211/212 will be evaluated by faculty. | 60% of PSC 211/212 students should be at the satisfactory level (70%) or higher in answering basic questions related to organic chemistry reactions and synthesis. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | <p>Students who obtained 90% or more of the points were rated "proficient". Students who obtained between 70 and 89% of the points were rated "satisfactory". Students who obtained less than 70% of the points were rated "unsatisfactory".</p> <p>77% of PSC 211 students (22 students evaluated on quizzes and an</p> | <p>Instruction will continue in the current manner.</p> |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|-----------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 2.1 (SLO) | TSW recognize and interpret structure, reactions, mechanisms, and synthesis of organic compounds. | Questions related to reactions and synthesis from quizzes and exams in PSC 211/212 will be evaluated by faculty. | 60% of PSC 211/212 students should be at the satisfactory level (70%) or higher in answering basic questions related to organic chemistry reactions and synthesis. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | exam; 5 at unsatisfactory, 16 at satisfactory, 1 at proficient) scored at the satisfactory level (70%) or higher in answering questions related to instrumentation. Target of 60% was achieved. | Instruction will continue in the current manner. |
| | 2.2 (SLO) | TSW effectively present information in oral and written forms in the area of organic chemistry. | An oral presentation will be evaluated in PSC 212 by faculty using the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric. | 75% of PSC 212 students should score at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric in delivering an oral presentation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 94% of PSC 212 students (16 students evaluated on an oral presentation; 5 at level 3 and 11 at level 4) scored at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric in delivering an oral presentation. Target of 75% was achieved. | Instruction will continue in the current manner. |
| | | | Formal lab reports will be evaluated in PSC 211L by faculty using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. | 75% of PSC 211L students should score at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric in writing a formal lab report. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 91% of PSC 211L students (22 students evaluated on two formal lab reports; 2 at level 2, 6 at level 3, and 14 at level 4) scored at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric in writing a formal lab report. Target of 75% was achieved. | Instruction will continue in the current manner. |
| | 3.1 (SAO & SLO) | TSW demonstrate a general knowledge of the major branches of | All Chemistry majors will take the Chemistry MFT | 90% of Chemistry majors taking the Chemistry MFT will | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There was one Chemistry major who graduated in | The Chemistry faculty work with the graduating seniors to prepare them for the MFT. The faculty will |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|-----------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 3.1 (SAO & SLO) | chemistry covered on the Chemistry Major Field Test (MFT) from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). | during the semester of their graduation. The MFT is graded by ETS and the results compared to other scores nationally. These results are sent to the department and will be evaluated by faculty to determine if achievement target was met. | score in the satisfactory level (25th percentile) or higher. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | May 2017. The student took the Chemistry Major Fields Test (MFT) during the semester of his graduation. He scored in the 37th percentile. Target was met. | continue to do this. |
| | 4.1 (PO 2.c.) | Chemistry majors will participate in activities that strengthen and expand K-12 partnerships. | Chemistry major students will complete an Exit Survey during the semester of their graduation. On the Exit Survey, students will answer questions concerning their participation in K-12 outreach activities. Faculty will review and analyze the Exit Survey to determine if Chemistry major students participated in at least one outreach activity. | 100% of Exit Survey participants (Chemistry majors) will participate in at least one outreach activity. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There was one Chemistry major who graduated in May 2017. On his Exit Survey he indicated that he had volunteered during the MS Regional High School Science Bowl. Target achieved. | Most MUW Sciences and Mathematics majors participate in K-12 outreach events. The faculty will continue to encourage this participation. |
| Program - Communication (including Minor) - BA, BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate clear, correct, goal-directed writing skills. | Using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric, departmental faculty will assess student writing samples from relevant courses | The average score of assessed student writing samples from upper-level courses will be at least 3 on the 4-point Written Communication rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The overall mean score for writing samples drawn from upper-level courses was 3.033 on the 4-point Written Communication rubric. The mean score for samples from COM 307 was 3.057, and the mean score from samples | Continue to assess student writing performance in upper-level courses. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Program - Communication (including Minor) - BA, BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate clear, correct, goal-directed writing skills. | Using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric, departmental faculty will assess student writing samples from relevant courses | The average score of assessed student writing samples from upper-level courses will be at least 3 on the 4-point Written Communication rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | from COM 465 was 3.000. These courses differ in the type of writing required. Whereas COM 307 is an upper-level course focused on journalistic writing, COM 465 is a theory-focused course that requires students to write research and analysis papers using APA (American Psychological Association) writing guidelines and citation style. Thus, it is not possible to make a course-to-course comparison between these two courses as representative of a direct progression in demonstrated skill. However, the comparison between mean scores from lower-level courses (2.443) and upper-level courses (3.033) does demonstrate a progression in demonstrated skills as students advance through the curriculum. | Continue to assess student writing performance in upper-level courses. |
| | | | Using the AAC&U Written Communication | The average score of assessed student writing samples from | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The overall mean was 2.443 on the 4-point Written | Continue to assess student writing performance in relevant courses. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | | | VALUE rubric, departmental faculty will assess student writing samples from relevant courses. | sophomore-level courses will be at least 2 on the 4-point Written Communication rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Communication rubric. The mean score for writing samples drawn from COM 200 was 2.222 (n = 9), and the mean score for writing samples drawn from COM 250 was 2.840 (n = 5). These results indicate students are demonstrating generally clear writing and that their demonstrated proficiency is improving from one course to the next -- especially in the sub-scores for Context (2.111 improved to 3.000) and Syntax (2.111 improved to 2.800). | Continue to assess student writing performance in relevant courses. |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Students will demonstrate appropriate use of video production equipment. | Using the Video Production Skills rubric, departmental faculty will assess student production samples from relevant courses. | At least 80 percent of assessed student production samples will score at least 3 on the 4-point Video Production Skills rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The mean score on Video Production rubric was 3.125 on a 4-point scale. Ten out of 12 production samples scored at least 3 out of 4, which is 83.33 percent of the total sampled. The two samples that did not meet the threshold were drawn from the introductory production course (COM 103). The mean score for this course was 2.971 (n = 7). The mean score for | Continue to assess video production skills proficiency in relevant courses. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Students will demonstrate appropriate use of video production equipment. | Using the Video Production Skills rubric, departmental faculty will assess student production samples from relevant courses. | At least 80 percent of assessed student production samples will score at least 3 on the 4-point Video Production Skills rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | productions sampled from the upper-level course (COM 431) was 3.240 (n = 5). The scores represent an overall increase in demonstrated proficiency with use of video production equipment from the lower-level course to the upper-level course. | Continue to assess video production skills proficiency in relevant courses. |
| | 2.2 (SLO) | Students will demonstrate appropriate use of audio production equipment. | Using the Audio Production Skills rubric, departmental faculty will assess student production samples from relevant courses. | At least 80 percent of assessed student production samples will score at least 3 on the 4-point Audio Production Skills rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | The mean score on the Audio Production rubric was 2.750 on a 4-point scale. Of the 12 production samples drawn from COM 103 and COM 431, 8 scored 3 or better (an overall rate of 66.67 percent). The mean for production samples from the introductory course (COM 103) was 2.571, and the mean for samples drawn from the upper-level course (COM 431) was 3.000. This does represent a significant improvement from one course to the next, with the students from the upper-level course benefiting from increased attention to audio production | Increase emphasis on audio production in COM 103. In the absence of demand for the upper-level audio production course (COM 331), COM 103 must continue to be adapted to prepare students with this necessary skill set. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|---|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 2.2 (SLO) | Students will demonstrate appropriate use of audio production equipment. | Using the Audio Production Skills rubric, departmental faculty will assess student production samples from relevant courses. | At least 80 percent of assessed student production samples will score at least 3 on the 4-point Audio Production Skills rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | in the courses. | Increase emphasis on audio production in COM 103. In the absence of demand for the upper-level audio production course (COM 331), COM 103 must continue to be adapted to prepare students with this necessary skill set. |
| | 3.1 (SAO) | Students will complete professional portfolios that showcase their skills for potential employers or graduate schools. | Faculty will use a departmental rubric (Communication Student Portfolio Rubric) to assess portfolios produced by students in Communication Senior Seminar (COM 465). | At least 90 percent of assessed student portfolios will score at least 80 on the 100-point Communication Student Portfolio rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The mean score for the sampled student portfolios was 92.5 on a 100-point scale using the departmental Communication Student Portfolio rubric. Of the 10 portfolios sampled, 9 scored 80 or better, for a total of 90 percent. Overall, these results are very positive and indicate students near completion of the program have amassed a substantial body of professional work and demonstrated the ability to organize this work into a coherent portfolio. | Continue to emphasis to students across the program the need to retain examples of professional work for their portfolios. |
| | 3.2 (PO 2.e.) | Students will engage in meaningful, real-life experiences within the Communication field. | Students in Communication Internship (COM 460) will complete an Exit Survey at the end of their internship. Departmental faculty will review and analyze the results to determine | At least 85 percent of students participating in the Exit Survey will rate their internship experience positively as defined by a score of 4 or greater, on a scale of 1-7. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100 percent of students surveyed rated their internship positively (4 or greater on a 7-point scale). The mean rating was 6.8 (N = 11). | Continue to assess internship experiences of students. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|---------------|--|---|---|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 3.2 (PO 2.e.) | Students will engage in meaningful, real-life experiences within the Communication field. | if the achievement target was met. | At least 85 percent of students participating in the Exit Survey will rate their internship experience positively as defined by a score of 4 or greater, on a scale of 1-7. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100 percent of students surveyed rated their internship positively (4 or greater on a 7-point scale). The mean rating was 6.8 (N = 11). | Continue to assess internship experiences of students. |
| Program - Creative Writing - MFA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will complete a portfolio of work that demonstrates mastery of language and conventions of a genre. | Faculty will assess the students' theses using the MFA Writing Skills Rubric that measures skill with the mechanics of language, aesthetic use of language, and use of conventions of the genre being studied. | Thesis students will achieve on their theses an average of at least 88% on the MFA Writing Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 2 students have completed their theses in 2016-2017. Their defenses are scheduled for the end of May. Using the same rubric for MFA Writing Skills, both students were ranked 88% or higher with scores of 15/15. | Since we met our target for thesis, we can continue doing what we have been doing in our program. The two successful theses show that the end result of our program has been what we envisioned. We will have more data next year with more students completing their theses; however, this is a positive result for our first year. |
| | | | Students in courses designated as Workshop will be assessed with a rubric that measures skill with the mechanics of language, aesthetic use of language, and use of conventions of the genre being studied. Each instructor will complete the MFA Writing Skills Rubric after grading final portfolios for the class. | Students will achieve on their final portfolios an average of at least 80% on the MFA Writing Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Of the 59 students assessed, 37 met the goal of 80% on the rubric, 4 earned 70% on the rubric, 5 earned 60%, and 13 earned less than 60%. This does not correspond to student grades in these courses, where most students earned A's or B's (suggesting that 80% or higher would be a reasonable score), and only one or two earned a C, so why are 37% of our students ranked under 80%? Grades and assessment do not correlate exactly | Because this was our first year assessing using this rubric, and because most faculty had not done assessment of any kind before, our results varied widely from section to section. Our main action, then, needs to be to calibrate the rubric and better communicate the goals that we want to achieve, primarily what we mean by "publishable quality" in the rubric. We plan to continue using the rubric and compare our results next year, looking for consistency. However, we also realized that the goals we set were unrealistic. Rather than just adjusting our use of the rubric so that we will meet our objectives, it makes more sense to also adjust our goals so that we can accurately assess students, yet allow for the fact that some students, especially those new to the program, may not meet those |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | Students in courses designated as Workshop will be assessed with a rubric that measures skill with the mechanics of language, aesthetic use of language, and use of conventions of the genre being studied. Each instructor will complete the MFA Writing Skills Rubric after grading final portfolios for the class. | Students will achieve on their final portfolios an average of at least 80% on the MFA Writing Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | <p>since grades are based on more criteria, yet there shouldn't be this much discrepancy. Possibly the goal has been set too high.</p> <p>Scores also varied widely by instructor, suggesting that work needs to be done to calibrate the rubric and communicate what each ranking means. As we consider our actions, it will be important to determine whether we are dissatisfied with our student's performance or whether we were inaccurate in our application of the rubric in our first year of using it. If we are dissatisfied with student performance, then we should address strategies we can use to help them improve. if our goals are unrealistic or our interpretation of the rubric is inconsistent, then we need to adjust our rankings. It is likely that a combination of those two approaches will be</p> | <p>goals on every criterion. To account for new students, which we admit every semester, some of whom have potential but have some areas of deficiency that they need to improve upon, we will adjust our goal to say that 80% of students assessed will achieve an average of 80% on the MFA Writing Skill Rubric. This seems to be a more realistic goal. Though we would not have met it last year, with better calibration of the rubric and attention to this goal in our classes, we should be able to meet it in the future.</p> |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | Students in courses designated as Workshop will be assessed with a rubric that measures skill with the mechanics of language, aesthetic use of language, and use of conventions of the genre being studied. Each instructor will complete the MFA Writing Skills Rubric after grading final portfolios for the class. | Students will achieve on their final portfolios an average of at least 80% on the MFA Writing Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | necessary. | Because this was our first year assessing using this rubric, and because most faculty had not done assessment of any kind before, our results varied widely from section to section. Our main action, then, needs to be to calibrate the rubric and better communicate the goals that we want to achieve, primarily what we mean by "publishable quality" in the rubric. We plan to continue using the rubric and compare our results next year, looking for consistency. However, we also realized that the goals we set were unrealistic. Rather than just adjusting our use of the rubric so that we will meet our objectives, it makes more sense to also adjust our goals so that we can accurately assess students, yet allow for the fact that some students, especially those new to the program, may not meet those goals on every criterion. To account for new students, which we admit every semester, some of whom have potential but have some areas of deficiency that they need to improve upon, we will adjust our goal to say that 80% of students assessed will achieve an average of 80% on the MFA Writing Skill Rubric. This seems to be a more realistic goal. Though we would not have met it last year, with better calibration of the rubric and attention to this goal in our classes, we should be able to meet it in the future. |
| | 2.1 (RO & SLO) | Students will conduct research in literary scholarship, pedagogy, or the craft of writing and produce essays or other | Students completing Masters Theses will include a bibliography of works related to the | Students will achieve on their Thesis Bibliographies an average of at least 88% on the MFA | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 2 students completed theses in 2016-2017. Both were rated higher than 88% on the | Since we met our target for thesis, we can continue doing what we have been doing in our program. The two successful theses show that the end result of our program |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | 2.1 (RO & SLO) | projects based on that research. | genre of the thesis. Faculty will assess the students' thesis bibliographies using the MFA Research Skills Rubric. | Research Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | MFA Research Skills Rubric with scores of 15 and 14 out of 15 on the rubric. | has been what we envisioned. We will have more data next year with more students completing their theses; however, this is a positive result for our first year. |
| | | | Students in Forms and Literature classes will be assessed with a rubric that measures their use of scholarly sources appropriate to their topic. Each instructor will complete the MFA Research Skills Rubric after grading the designated project for the class. | Students will achieve on their Forms and Literature project an average of at least 80% on the MFA Research Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Of the 44 students assessed, 31 met our target of 80% on the rubric, 2 earned 70%, and 11 earned 60%. None were below 60%. Additionally, there was significant improvement between Fall and Spring semesters, with 10 students ranked lower than 80% in the Fall and only 3 in the Spring. This suggests that students improved after their second semester. However, there were more students in research based classes in the fall (26) than in the Spring (18), which may account for some of the change between semesters. Nonetheless 38% of students in the Fall did not meet our goal, and only 17% of students in the Spring did not meet our goal. | Because this was our first year assessing using this rubric, and because most faculty had not done assessment of any kind before, our results varied widely from section to section. Our main action, then, needs to be to calibrate the rubric and better communicate the goals that we want to achieve, primarily what we mean by "graduate-level research" in the rubric. We plan to continue using the rubric and compare our results next year, looking for consistency. However, we also realized that the goals we set were unrealistic. Rather than just adjusting our use of the rubric so that we will meet our objectives, it makes more sense to also adjust our goals so that we can accurately assess students, yet allow for the fact that some students, especially those new to the program, may not meet those goals on every criterion. To account for new students, which we admit every semester, some of whom have potential but have some areas of deficiency that they need to improve upon, we will adjust our goal to say that 80% of students assessed will achieve an average of 80% on the MFA Research Skills Rubric. This seems to be a more realistic goal. Though we would not have met it last year, with better calibration of the rubric and attention to this goal in our classes, we should be able to meet it in the |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------------|--|---|---|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | Students in Forms and Literature classes will be assessed with a rubric that measures their use of scholarly sources appropriate to their topic. Each instructor will complete the MFA Research Skills Rubric after grading the designated project for the class. | Students will achieve on their Forms and Literature project an average of at least 80% on the MFA Research Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Of the 44 students assessed, 31 met our target of 80% on the rubric, 2 earned 70%, and 11 earned 60%. None were below 60%. Additionally, there was significant improvement between Fall and Spring semesters, with 10 students ranked lower than 80% in the Fall and only 3 in the Spring. This suggests that students improved after their second semester. However, there were more students in research based classes in the fall (26) than in the Spring (18), which may account for some of the change between semesters. Nonetheless 38% of students in the Fall did not meet our goal, and only 17% of students in the Spring did not meet our goal. | future. |
| | 3.1 (SAO & PO 2.d.) | Students will publish their work in appropriate publications for their genres. | The program director will review and analyze the Master's Thesis Survey results to determine students' publication history. | 90% of students participating in the Master's Thesis Survey will report that by the time they defend their thesis they have published at least one work in a literary journal or had a play published or produced | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Our students have published their work in many journals. The 2 students who are completing their theses both have published at least one work. One of our students | We will continue to support student publications by publicizing their successes in publishing, presenting seminars on how to publish in magazines, promoting publishing opportunities, and encouraging publication in our workshop classes. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|--|---|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | 3.1 (SAO & PO 2.d.) | Students will publish their work in appropriate publications for their genres. | The program director will review and analyze the Master's Thesis Survey results to determine students' publication history. | or had their writing published in another outlet appropriate to the genre. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | recently signed a 3-book contract for a sci-fi trilogy. Our other student recently had an essay published in Ninth Letter. These are only the two most recent publications by these writers. | We will continue to support student publications by publicizing their successes in publishing, presenting seminars on how to publish in magazines, promoting publishing opportunities, and encouraging publication in our workshop classes. |
| | 3.2 (SLO) | Students will understand the literary marketplace and other career options for writers. | Students in EN 502 Full Writing Residency will complete a Professional Knowledge Survey measuring their knowledge of the literary marketplace and other career options on a 5-point Likert scale where 5 is Strongly Agree. | 85% of EN 502 students participating in the Professional Knowledge Survey will have an average score of greater than 3 (Satisfied) on a scale on 1-5. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | None. We have not had a Full Residency where we could administer this survey. | We will conduct this survey in EN 502 Full Writing Residency in June 2017. |
| | | | Students participating in the Master's Thesis Survey will answer the same questions as on the Professional Knowledge Survey to determine if students improved from their time in the EN 502 Full Writing Residency course to the end of the program. Faculty will review and compare the surveys' results. | 90% of students participating in the Master's Thesis Survey will have an average score of greater than 3 (Satisfied) on a scale of 1-5 on the "Professional Knowledge" portion of the Master's Thesis Survey. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | None. Masters Thesis students have not completed the Professional Knowledge Survey in EN 502 Full Writing Residency yet. | We will conduct this survey in EN 502 Full Writing Residency in June 2017. |
| Program - English | 1.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will analyze language through close | In a sample group of essays, the student's | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8- | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The related document data and | We will continue data in order to analyze the connection (if any) |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|----------------|-------------------|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| (including Minor and Secondary Education Certification, Minor in Creative Writing, and TESL Certification) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.c.) | reading of texts. | writing will be evaluated with department rubric 1. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. A total of at least four faculty members will be involved, since different faculty committee will be assessing using the two different rubrics. | 12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 90% of students will be able to analyze language using close reading in a text by scoring at least "proficient" on the department rubric 1. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | the department rubric example will clear up the slight confusion in the language "rubric 1" and "rubric 2." The department rubric actually is ONE rubric, but has TWO sections: 1a and 1b. These results deal with section 1a: Students will analyze language through close reading of texts. The rubric applied to these papers has three levels: Exemplary, Proficient, and Not Meeting Minimum Standards. Using a sample group of 19 essays from 2016-2017, eleven from 300 level courses required in the major (EN 303, 304, 360 & 370), and eight papers selected from the fall and spring sections of EN 499 Capstone the faculty committee of three (who did not score any EN 101 papers) had the following results: Percent overall of papers which scored at least P on 1a = 94.7% Percent of 300 level | between the department rubric and the VALUE rubric applied to these papers. In addition, advisors of English majors will be careful to advise students to complete at least 3 300 level courses at MUW before they take Capstone. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|----------------|--|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Program - English (including Minor and Secondary Education Certification, Minor in Creative Writing, and TESL Certification) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will analyze language through close reading of texts. | In a sample group of essays, the student's writing will be evaluated with department rubric 1. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. A total of at least four faculty members will be involved, since different faculty committee will be assessing using the two different rubrics. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 90% of students will be able to analyze language using close reading in a text by scoring at least "proficient" on the department rubric 1. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | papers which scored at least P on 1a = 91% Percent of Capstone papers which scored at least P on 1a = 100% The department is satisfied that the sample of papers satisfies the Achievement Target of 90%. In fact, the target is exceed overall and in the different categories. However, the committee noted that of the eight Capstone students, only 2 scored an E (or Exemplary) on section 1a. The department assumes that English Capstone students should mostly exemplary in their abilities to read and analyze texts closely. It is possible that two many Capstone students are taking the course before they have completed a significant number of 300 level courses at MUW. | We will continue data in order to analyze the connection (if any) between the department rubric and the VALUE rubric applied to these papers. In addition, advisors of English majors will be careful to advise students to complete at least 3 300 level courses at MUW before they take Capstone. |
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the student's writing will be | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 students who will | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Using a sample group of 19 essays from 2016-2017, | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | evaluated with the AAU&C RUBRIC on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. A total of at least four faculty members will be involved, since different faculty committee will be assessing using the two different rubrics. | not graduate by end of academic year from an assignment in EN 303, 304, or 360 and at least 8-12 students from EN 499: English Capstone course), students will score an average of at least 3 or higher on the AAU&C VALUE Rubric on Written Communication. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | <p>elevated from 300 level courses required in the major (EN 303, 304, 360 & 370), and eight papers selected from the fall and spring sections of EN 499 Capstone the faculty committee of three (who did not score any EN 101 papers) had the following results when applying the AAU&C Rubric on Written Communication.</p> <p>For 300 level papers: Average—2.9 Range: 1.8—3.2 For Capstone Papers: Average—3.13 Range: 2.43—4 Overall Average: 2.97 Range 1.8—4</p> <p>While there were a few papers in the 3.5-4 range, and the overall average score is close to target range (2.97 could actually be rounded up to 3), it is troubling that some upper level students are having trouble scoring at least a 3 (upper milestone level) in these courses. In looking more closely</p> | minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the student's writing will be evaluated with the AAU&C RUBRIC on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. A total of at least four faculty members will be involved, since different faculty committee will be assessing using the two different rubrics. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 students who will not graduate by end of academic year from an assignment in EN 303, 304, or 360 and at least 8-12 students from EN 499: English Capstone course), students will score an average of at least 3 or higher on the AAU&C VALUE Rubric on Written Communication. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | level student who had particular trouble is not a native English speaker, although she is rapidly improving in her work. Her scores will likely improve next year. The faculty suspect that since students no longer have to write about literature in EN 102 (English Composition II) or use secondary source research in all 200 level literature surveys, they may not be sufficiently prepared in writing about literature or using secondary research as they enter 300 level courses. On the other hand, the students with scores below a 3 in Capstone still completed the class with satisfactory work (at least a C), and therefore are sufficiently prepared English majors. More positively, though, all of the seniors who are now certified to teach English and Language Arts in grades 7-12 scored | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the student's writing will be evaluated with the AAU&C RUBRIC on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. A total of at least four faculty members will be involved, since different faculty committee will be assessing using the two different rubrics. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 students who will not graduate by end of academic year from an assignment in EN 303, 304, or 360 and at least 8-12 students from EN 499: English Capstone course), students will score an average of at least 3 or higher on the AAU&C VALUE Rubric on Written Communication. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | well above a 3 on their Capstone papers. | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |
| | 1.2 (GEO 1.c.) | Majors will construct and defend arguments using textual evidence. | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | 90% of students will be able to construct and defend arguments using textual evidence by scoring at least "proficient" on the department rubric 2. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | The related document data and the department rubric example will clear up the slight confusion in the language "rubric 1" and "rubric 2." The department rubric actually is ONE rubric, but has TWO sections: 1a and 1b. These results deal with section 1b: Students will construct and defend arguments using textual evidence. The rubric applied to these papers has | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 1.2 (GEO 1.c.) | Majors will construct and defend arguments using textual evidence. | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | 90% of students will be able to construct and defend arguments using textual evidence by scoring at least "proficient" on the department rubric 2. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | <p>three levels: Exemplary, Proficient, and Not Meeting Minimum Standards. Using a sample group of 19 essays from 2016-2017, eleven from 300 level courses required in the major (EN 303, 304, 360 & 370), and eight papers selected from the fall and spring sections of EN 499 Capstone the faculty committee of three (who did not score any EN 101 papers) had the following results:</p> <p>Percent overall of papers which scored at least P on 1b = 89.4%</p> <p>Percent of 300 level papers which scored at least P on 1b = 82%</p> <p>Percent of Capstone papers which scored at least P on 1b = 100%</p> <p>These scores, together with the scores on 1a, seem to reflect the scores on the AAU&C Written Communication Value Rubric. We are only slightly under the target of</p> | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1.2 (GEO 1.c.) | Majors will construct and defend arguments using textual evidence. | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | 90% of students will be able to construct and defend arguments using textual evidence by scoring at least "proficient" on the department rubric 2. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 90% with the overall average, but this average is helped by the fact that 100% of the Capstone students scored "proficient," and three of the Capstone students actually scored "exemplary" on 1b. The faculty suspect that since students no longer have to write about literature in EN 102 (English Composition II) or use secondary source research in all 200 level literature surveys, they may not be sufficiently prepared in writing about literature or using secondary research as they enter 300 level courses. | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 100% of English Capstone students will demonstrate proficient or | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The related document data and the department rubric example will clear up the slight confusion in the language "rubric 1" and "rubric 2." The department rubric actually is ONE rubric, but has TWO sections: 1a and 1b. These results deal with section 1a: | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | exemplary ability to construct and defend arguments using textual evidence as measured by departmental rubric 2. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | <p>Students will analyze language through close reading of texts. The rubric applied to these papers has three levels: Exemplary, Proficient, and Not Meeting Minimum Standards. Using a sample group of 19 essays from 2016-2017, eleven from 300 level courses required in the major (EN 303, 304, 360 & 370), and eight papers selected from the fall and spring sections of EN 499 Capstone the faculty committee of three (who did not score any EN 101 papers) had the following results:</p> <p>Percent overall of papers which scored at least P on 1a = 94.7%</p> <p>Percent of 300 level papers which scored at least P on 1a = 91%</p> <p>Percent of Capstone papers which scored at least P on 1a = 100%</p> <p>The department is satisfied that the sample of papers satisfies the</p> | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 100% of English Capstone students will demonstrate proficient or exemplary ability to construct and defend arguments using textual evidence as measured by departmental rubric 2. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Achievement Target of 90%. In fact, the target is exceed overall and in the different categories. However, the committee noted that of the eight Capstone students, only 2 scored an E (or Exemplary) on section 1a. The department assumes that English Capstone students should mostly exemplary in their abilities to read and analyze texts closely. It is possible that two many Capstone students are taking the course before they have completed a significant number of 300 level courses at MUW. | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 90% of 300 level major students will demonstrate proficient or exemplary ability to construct and defend | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | The related document data and the department rubric example will clear up the slight confusion in the language "rubric 1" and "rubric 2." The department rubric actually is ONE rubric, but has TWO sections: 1a and 1b. These results deal with section 1b: Students will construct and | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | arguments using textual evidence as measured by departmental rubric 2. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | defend arguments using textual evidence. The rubric applied to these papers has three levels: Exemplary, Proficient, and Not Meeting Minimum Standards. Using a sample group of 19 essays from 2016-2017, eleven from 300 level courses required in the major (EN 303, 304, 360 & 370), and eight papers selected from the fall and spring sections of EN 499 Capstone the faculty committee of three (who did not score any EN 101 papers) had the following results: Percent overall of papers which scored at least P on 1b = 89.4% Percent of 300 level papers which scored at least P on 1b = 82% These scores, together with the scores on 1a, seem to reflect the scores on the AAU&C Written Communication Value Rubric. We are only slightly | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students writing will be evaluated with department rubric 2. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 90% of 300 level major students will demonstrate proficient or exemplary ability to construct and defend arguments using textual evidence as measured by departmental rubric 2. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | under the target of 90% with the overall average, but we are 7 percentage points below the target for 300 level students. The faculty suspect that since students no longer have to write about literature in EN 102 (English Composition II) or use secondary source research in all 200 level literature surveys, they may not be sufficiently prepared in writing about literature or using secondary research as they enter 300 level courses. | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students' writing will be evaluated with the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 300 level students will score an average of at least a 3 (lower Capstone level) on constructing and defending arguments using textual evidence as measured by the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Using a sample group of 19 essays from 2016-2017, eleven from 300 level courses required in the major (EN 303, 304, 360 & 370), and eight papers selected from the fall and spring sections of EN 499 Capstone the faculty committee of three (who did not score any EN 101 papers) had the following results when applying the AAU&C Rubric on Written | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|--------------------|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students' writing will be evaluated with the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | Communication. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | <p>Communication.</p> <p>For 300 level papers: Average—2.9 Range: 1.8—3.2</p> <p>While there were a few papers in the 3.5-4 range, and the overall average score is close to target range (2.9 could actually be rounded up to 3), it is troubling that some upper level students are having trouble scoring at least a 3 (upper milestone level) in these courses. In looking more closely at the individual papers, one 300 level student who had particular trouble is not a native English speaker, although she is rapidly improving in her work. Her scores will likely improve next year. The faculty suspect that since students no longer have to write about literature in EN 102 (English Composition II) or use secondary source research in all 200 level literature surveys, they may not be</p> | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students' writing will be evaluated with the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) 300 level students will score an average of at least a 3 (lower Capstone level) on constructing and defending arguments using textual evidence as measured by the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | prepared in writing about literature or using secondary research as they enter 300 level courses. | Faculty are discussing an addition of a 200 literature survey course designated for English majors and minors. This class will be more writing intensive. We will continue the discussion in the fall to decide on literature content, among other issues. In addition, advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students' writing will be evaluated with the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) students will score an average of at least a 3 (lower Capstone level) on constructing and defending arguments using textual evidence as measured by the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Using a sample group of 19 essays from 2016-2017, eleven from 300 level courses required in the major (EN 303, 304, 360 & 370), and eight papers selected from the fall and spring sections of EN 499 Capstone the faculty committee of three (who did not score any EN 101 papers) had the following results when applying the AAU&C Rubric on Written Communication. For Capstone Papers: Average— | English major advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | In a sample group of essays, the students' writing will be evaluated with the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. At least two English faculty members (not the faculty member who taught the class from which the essay was generated) will assess the student work. | In a sample group of essays (16-24 total: 8-12 from students who will NOT graduate by end of academic year from EN 303-304 & EN 360 AND 8-12 total of students who have completed EN 499: English Capstone) students will score an average of at least a 3 (lower Capstone level) on constructing and defending arguments using textual evidence as measured by the AAU&C Value Rubric on Written Communication. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 3.13 Range: 2.43—4 While there were a few papers in the 3.5-4 range, and the overall average score is above the target range, it is troubling that 50 percent of this year's Capstone students are having trouble scoring at least a 3 (upper milestone level) in this class. Faculty suspect that too many students are taking Capstone before they have taken enough 300 level courses to hone their skills in written communication. On the other hand, the students with scores below a 3 in Capstone still completed the class with satisfactory work (at least a C), and therefore are sufficiently prepared English majors. More positively, though, all of the seniors who are now certified to teach English and Language Arts in grades 7-12 scored well above a 3 on their Capstone papers. | English major advisors will urge their advisees not to enroll in EN 499 Capstone until they have completed at least 3 300 level English classes at MUW or at another four year school. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|---|------------------|--------------|---|---|
| | 1.3 (SLO) | Senior majors will exhibit at least proficient level reading, writing and analytic skills. | Graduating MUW native senior English majors randomly selected to take the CLA+ test by the QEP director who decide to take the test, which is optional. | 90% of senior English majors will score at least Proficient in all tested areas on the CLA+ standardized test. This test targets the following areas (which also mirror MUW General Education Requirements): Analysis and Problem Solving; Writing Effectiveness; Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning; Critical Reading and Evaluation, and Critiquing an Argument. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | In 2016 year none of our seniors elected to take the CLA+, and results are not yet available for the spring 2017 students. | We will specifically urge our seniors to take the CLA+ if they are selected to take the test. We will also send the names of seniors eligible to take the CLA+ to the QEP director so that he can contact them if they are not on his list. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will write an essay which has a thesis and develops an argument using documentation of sources. | Sample group of EN 101 Essays written in response to an assignment which requires a thesis statement and accurate documentation of at least one source. At least two faculty members (who have not taught the sections from which the samples were taken) will apply the rubric to the sample set. | EN 101 sample group of at least 20 papers (from at least four sections taught by at least four different faculty members) will score an average of at least 1.5 or higher on the AAU&C Written Communication rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | <p>A sample of twenty-four EN 101 papers from fall and spring and from sections taught by six different faculty members were assessed with the Written Communication Value Rubric. (See attached table with individual scores in related documents.)</p> <p>The overall Average Score was 2.45 with a Range of 1.6 to 3.3 We Met Goal of 1.5 (100% of the students met the goal)</p> <p>Only a few students</p> | Faculty suggest that next years sample set be 35 papers. The make up of the faculty members who assessed these composition papers will stay the same next May. The call for sample papers will specifically describe the type of paper being assessed by the committee. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will write an essay which has a thesis and develops an argument using documentation of sources. | Sample group of EN 101 Essays written in response to an assignment which requires a thesis statement and accurate documentation of at least one source. At least two faculty members (who have not taught the sections from which the samples were taken) will apply the rubric to the sample set. | EN 101 sample group of at least 20 papers (from at least four sections taught by at least four different faculty members) will score an average of at least 1.5 or higher on the AAU&C Written Communication rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | were even close to the lower 1.5 level, and faculty suspected that since all of those essays resulted from a creative assignment, they were not required to use documentation of a source. Faculty agreed that they need to be sure they are not inflating the student scores, since so many of them scored in the upper milestone range. They want to remain on this scoring committee for two more years because they want to become more skilled in applying the rubric. | Faculty suggest that next years sample set be 35 papers. The make up of the faculty members who assessed these composition papers will stay the same next May. The call for sample papers will specifically describe the type of paper being assessed by the committee. |
| | 3.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will receive a quality English education meeting students' expectations satisfactorily. | At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the Capstone Survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of students participating in the Capstone Survey will indicate a "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" satisfaction level reflective of the English department's curriculum and instruction quality. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | This year the Capstone Survey was not administered and student focus groups were used instead. The Capstone survey is too long and cumbersome. (See related document). In the focus group, a total of 6 graduating seniors indicated that they were very satisfied with their English major. | We want to use focus groups again next year, since students say the survey takes too long to fill out. We can find out the Target information more easily in focus groups. We will have a group of at least six graduating seniors participate in a focus group next May. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|--|---|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | 3.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will receive a quality English education meeting students' expectations satisfactorily. | At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the Capstone Survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of students participating in the Capstone Survey will indicate a "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" satisfaction level reflective of the English department's curriculum and instruction quality. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | However, they are not sure that they are taking enough courses to give them a broad education in all areas: World, British, and American Literature. They all said that having to do an oral presentation on a particular period of literature was very helpful, since they not only had to review their assigned literary period, but also listen to their classmates' presentations. They felt this helped them "catch up" on areas with which they were not familiar. | We want to use focus groups again next year, since students say the survey takes too long to fill out. We can find out the Target information more easily in focus groups. We will have a group of at least six graduating seniors participate in a focus group next May. |
| | 3.2 (SAO) | Students will be actively engaged utilizing their English degrees. | The Alumni Survey is sent out every three years. The next rotation will be in 2019, 2022, and so on. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | 25% of students participating in the Alumni Survey will state that they are enrolled in graduate/professional degree program. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The Alumni survey will not be sent out again until 2019 | We will look forward to the results of the 2019 Alumni Survey. |
| | | | The Alumni Survey is sent out every three years. The next rotation will be in 2019, 2022, and so | 85% of students participating in the Alumni Survey will state that they are currently working in | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The Alumni Survey will not be sent out again until 2019. | We look forward to the 2019 survey results. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action | |
|-----------|--------------|---------|-------------------|---|---|-------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | | on. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | their field of study or in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the English program. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The Alumni Survey will not be sent out again until 2019. | We look forward to the 2019 survey results. |
| | | | | The Official Departmental Social Media Survey is sent out every year. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will analyze and compare the survey results to the previous academic year to determine if there was an increase or decrease in employment or graduate enrollment. | 5% increase from the previous academic year of English alumni students participating in the Official Departmental Social Media Survey stating that they are either employed in their field of study or in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the English program or are enrolled in a graduate/professional program. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | We did not compose an official social media survey, which makes our data more anecdotal than specific. This was a mistake we will not make again. However, we do keep up with our students' employment and graduate school successes. And two 2015 graduates who took a year off this year have now been accepted to graduate school for the fall in English and Creative Writing. All of last year's students who completed teacher certification are now in teaching jobs. Two of the Four TC students who just graduated in May 2017 have teaching jobs already. Those who are working out of their field (such as one in management of a store) indicate | We will continue to assess this information, but use a specific survey instead of anecdotal information. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|---|------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | | | The Official Departmental Social Media Survey is sent out every year. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will analyze and compare the survey results to the previous academic year to determine if there was an increase or decrease in employment or graduate enrollment. | 5% increase from the previous academic year of English alumni students participating in the Official Departmental Social Media Survey stating that they are either employed in their field of study or in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the English program or are enrolled in a graduate/professional program. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | that our degree prepared them to do well on writing reports and creating resumes and letter. In May, 2017, a 2009 graduate completed her Ph.D in English. One of our May, 2017 graduates was awarded a prestigious Strode English Assistantship at the University of Alabama--fully funded with a stipend and research travel money. Two 2015 graduates have completed Master's in Teaching degrees and have taught English in Mississippi public schools for two years. One 2015 graduate has been teaching English in China for a year and has signed a contract for next year. | We will continue to assess this information, but use a specific survey instead of anecdotal information. |
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Students will complete a portfolio of work that demonstrates a command of grammar, syntax, and aesthetic use of language (CW). | Students in EN 312 Creative Writing will be assessed with a rubric that measures creative use of language: the mechanics of grammar and syntax, aesthetic use of language, and use | Students in EN 312 will achieve on their Final Portfolios an average of at least 80% on the Writing Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In 2016-17, 20 students were assessed using the Writing Skills Rubric. (See related document table to see individual scores) | We will continue to assess EN 312 students with the Writing Skills Rubric |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Students will complete a portfolio of work that demonstrates a command of grammar, syntax, and aesthetic use of language (CW). | of conventions of the genres used in their Final Portfolios. Each instructor will complete the Writing Skills Rubric after grading Final Portfolios for the class. | Students in EN 312 will achieve on their Final Portfolios an average of at least 80% on the Writing Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In 2016-17, 20 students were assessed using the Writing Skills Rubric. (See related document table to see individual scores) | We will continue to assess EN 312 students with the Writing Skills Rubric |
| | | | Students in EN 419 Senior Portfolio will be assessed with a rubric that measures creative use of language: the mechanics of grammar and syntax, aesthetic use of language, and use of conventions of the genres used in their final portfolios. Each instructor will complete the Writing Skills Rubric after grading Senior Portfolios for the class. | Students in EN 419 will achieve on their Senior Portfolios an average of at least 88% on the Writing Skills Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In 2016-17 two EN 410 Senior Portfolios were assessed. Both of them met the target. Individual scores are on the related document table | We will continue to assess the EN 419 senior portfolios with the Writing Skills Rubric |
| | 5.1 (SLO) | Students will be able to discuss the conventions of a genre (CW). | Students in EN 311, EN 411, EN 412 and EN 415 will complete an exam that includes questions about the conventions of the genre being studied. | Students will achieve an average of at least 85% on the exam. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Thirty-seven students were enrolled in EN 311, EN 411, EN 412, and EN 415. Thirty-five were assessed with the Writing Skills Rubric because two students in an upper level writing course did not turn in their exams. The students who were assessed met the target. (See related Table | We will continue to assess the exams in these upper level writing courses. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|---|---|--|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | 5.1 (SLO) | Students will be able to discuss the conventions of a genre (CW). | Students in EN 311, EN 411, EN 412 and EN 415 will complete an exam that includes questions about the conventions of the genre being studied. | Students will achieve an average of at least 85% on the exam. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | attached) | We will continue to assess the exams in these upper level writing courses. |
| | 6.1 (SLO) | Students will develop the ability to teach English as a second language. | At the end of each semester, the department TESL director will review student records to determine if all course requirements for the TESL Certificate were met. | 25% of English majors and minors will earn the TESL certification by the time they graduate. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The year two students completed the TESL certificate and were awarded them on the Department Awards Day. Currently there are 6 majors and 2 students from other majors working on the TESL certificate. Of our graduates in 2016-17, nearly thirty percent earned TESL certificates. One certificate holder is now teaching in China, and one is working in Japan. | In the social media survey, we will ask completers to let us know if they are using their certificate information in any way in their employment or in graduate school. |
| Program - Film Studies - Minor {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 2.a.) | Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze films as cultural and aesthetic works. | Using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, departmental faculty will assess samples of written film analyses from students in relevant courses. | The average score of assessed film analyses from relevant lower-level courses will be at least 2 on the 4-point Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | Because of scheduling limitations, only one lower-level film course was taught during the reporting period (FLM 101 in Fall 2016). No analysis paper was included within the course during this semester, so there is no data to report for this specific target. | Add analysis paper to FLM 101 for inclusion in assessment data (even if not required for course grade). |
| | | | Using the AAC&U Intercultural | The average score of assessed film analyses | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Data was collected from COM 303 and | Consider whether a prerequisite should be added for COM 303, or |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | | | Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric, departmental faculty will assess samples of written film analyses from students in relevant courses. | from relevant upper-level courses will be at least 3 on the 4-point Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | FLM 301. The mean score for writing samples was 3.11 on a 4-point scale (with a mean of 2.98 for COM 303 and a mean of 3.24 for FLM 301). The data indicate that students are demonstrating their ability to analyze films as cultural and aesthetic works. Writing samples from FLM 301 did score somewhat higher on the rubric than did samples from COM 303. This could be the result of students having taken prerequisite FLM courses prior to taking FLM 301. (COM 303 has no prerequisite.) | whether more time could be spent on the relevant learning outcome within the course. |
| | 1.2 (SAO) | Students will demonstrate awareness of films from a variety of genres, cultures, and time periods. | Departmental faculty will assess the variety of films viewed by students in relevant courses with a survey. | At least 80 percent of students surveyed will report having viewed films from another country. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100 percent of students surveyed (from FLM 101, COM 303 & FLM 301) reported viewing at least one film from another country. | Consider incorporating these survey questions into a single Canvas module for future use. |
| | | | Departmental faculty will assess the variety of films viewed by students in relevant courses with a survey. | At least 80 percent of students surveyed will report having viewed films from more than two distinct time periods. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 83.7 percent of students surveyed reported watching films from more than two distinct time periods. (93 percent reported two or more time periods.) Results indicate students | As with other survey items, consider developing a Canvas module that can be re-used across courses. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | | | Departmental faculty will assess the variety of films viewed by students in relevant courses with a survey. | At least 80 percent of students surveyed will report having viewed films from more than two distinct time periods. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | are being exposed to a broad variety of films. | As with other survey items, consider developing a Canvas module that can be re-used across courses. |
| | | | Departmental faculty will assess the variety of films viewed by students in relevant courses with a survey. | At least 90 percent of students surveyed will report having viewed films from more than two genres. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100 percent of surveyed students (from FLM 101 and COM 303) reported viewing films from more than two genres. These courses feature a broad mix of films, and students were aware of the genres they viewed. (FLM 301 was excluded from this analysis because this special topics course was focused exclusively on horror films in Spring 2017. Thus, there was no expectation of multiple-genre viewing in the course.) | Integrate this survey into a Canvas module for the relevant courses. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate clear, concise writing about films. | Using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric, departmental faculty will assess student writing samples from relevant courses. | The average score of assessed student writing samples from upper-level courses will be at least 3 on the 4-point Written Communication rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The mean score on writing samples was 3.09 on a 4-point scale. However, writing samples from COM 303 scored only 2.89, vs. a mean of 3.29 for samples from FLM 301. Although the overall target was met, COM 303 writing samples missed the target when examined | Consider adding a prerequisite to COM 303 or considering it separately as a lower-level course. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|--|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate clear, concise writing about films. | Using the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE rubric, departmental faculty will assess student writing samples from relevant courses. | The average score of assessed student writing samples from upper-level courses will be at least 3 on the 4-point Written Communication rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | separately. This could be the result of FLM 301 having taken more prerequisite courses than did students in COM 303 (which has no prerequisite). | Consider adding a prerequisite to COM 303 or considering it separately as a lower-level course. |
| | 3.1 (SLO) | Students will show that they can access films in multiple content-delivery modes. | Using a survey, departmental faculty will assess the variety of modes (traditional cinema, online streaming services, TV broadcast, archival storage, etc.) used by students in relevant courses to watch films. | At least 80 percent of students surveyed will report having viewed films via two or more content-delivery modes. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Only 14 percent of students surveyed reported using multiple content-delivery modes. This is likely a data artifact, however. The results seem to be largely dependent on the course setting -- online students used streaming sources almost exclusively (with a few using DVD/Blu-Ray discs, as well). In-class students were shown course films projected on screen. Although the question was attempting to assess how many methods students generally use to watch films, it seems to have been interpreted as asking specifically about film viewing for the class in question. This question should be re-worded to make clear that it is asking about broader film | Update question to ensure clarity on the scope of film consumption being surveyed (i.e., not just within-course viewing). |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|---------------|---|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 3.1 (SLO) | Students will show that they can access films in multiple content-delivery modes. | Using a survey, departmental faculty will assess the variety of modes (traditional cinema, online streaming services, TV broadcast, archival storage, etc.) used by students in relevant courses to watch films. | At least 80 percent of students surveyed will report having viewed films via two or more content-delivery modes. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | consumption beyond one specific course. | Update question to ensure clarity on the scope of film consumption being surveyed (i.e., not just within-course viewing). |
| | 3.2 (PO 3.a.) | The program will encourage students to access films in a variety of content-delivery modes by using instructional technologies such as online course delivery to allow students flexibility in viewing films. | Departmental faculty will assess yearly course offerings to determine course-delivery mode. | At least 50 percent of relevant courses will be delivered via online course delivery. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | FLM 101 and COM 303 were delivered online, and FLM 301 and COM 499 were delivered face-to-face. Thus, 50 percent of film-related courses were delivered online. | Continue monitoring and assessing course-delivery modes to ensure effective instruction. |
| Program - Fine Arts (including Art History and Studio Art Minors) - BFA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will successfully complete the Foundation Portfolio Review as a BFA program entry requirement. | Students participating in ART 200 Foundation Portfolio Review are required to submit a portfolio of artwork from ART 103 Design I, ART 104 Design II, ART 105 Drawing I, ART 106 Drawing II, ART 195 Computers in Art, and other examples of works for studio courses to be evaluated with the departmental Foundation Portfolio Review rubric. A minimum of three faculty members will complete the assessments. | The average score of students assessed will be at least 7 “meets expectations” out of the eleven total areas using the departmental Foundation Portfolio Review rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Considering both Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 Foundation Portfolio Reviews, Target Met is a welcomed outcome. We had 9 students total with an average of “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations” of 8.55 overall. This data suggests that our students are being prepared by our fundamental course instruction as well as we are improving our community/junior college recruitment efforts reaching | Target Met. Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|--------------|--|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| Program - Fine Arts (including Art History and Studio Art Minors) - BFA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will successfully complete the Foundation Portfolio Review as a BFA program entry requirement. | Students participating in ART 200 Foundation Portfolio Review are required to submit a portfolio of artwork from ART 103 Design I, ART 104 Design II, ART 105 Drawing I, ART 106 Drawing II, ART 195 Computers in Art, and other examples of works for studio courses to be evaluated with the departmental Foundation Portfolio Review rubric. A minimum of three faculty members will complete the assessments. | The average score of students assessed will be at least 7 “meets expectations” out of the eleven total areas using the departmental Foundation Portfolio Review rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | students who also possess the necessary foundation skills. We are pleased with the efforts in ART 100 Seminar: Fundamentals to Success and ART 200 Foundation Portfolio Review to assist the students towards a successful review with specific instructional materials, access to examples, and best practices. For the Spring 2017 review, the CANVAS content for ART 200 was expanded with videos, forms, and good/bad writing examples to aid student’s success. | Target Met. Continue Actions. |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Students will complete the written formal analysis of one of their works of art as required in the Foundation Portfolio Review as a BFA program entry requirement. | Students participating in ART 200 Foundation Portfolio Review are required to submit a formal analysis of a work of art focusing on the formal elements (line, color, light, shape, etc.) in a composition. Additionally, the principles of design (what pulls the composition together and makes it work) are discussed in the | The average score of ART 200 students will be at least a “3” on the 1-4 scale using the departmental Formal Analysis Review rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | We are disappointed that we Did Not Meet Target for this outcome. Considering the data, our average for the three categories of assessment is 2.5. This is close to our target of 3 but we need to make efforts to achieve our target. We plan to place more emphasis on the areas of description, analysis, and | Target Not Met. Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Students will complete the written formal analysis of one of their works of art as required in the Foundation Portfolio Review as a BFA program entry requirement. | formal analysis which will be evaluated by the departmental Formal Analysis Review rubric. A minimum of three faculty members will complete the assessments. | The average score of ART 200 students will be at least a "3" on the 1-4 scale using the departmental Formal Analysis Review rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | identifying strengths/weaknesses in the ART 100 Seminar, ART 103 Design I, and ART 104 Design II. A concerted focus towards learning and becoming familiar with design vocabulary will be emphasized. Each instructor will create a short quiz at the beginning of the course that gauges each student's knowledge of design elements and principles and as the semester progresses another exam where they can identify the use of the design elements/principles in works of art. We are hoping to see improvement since we adapted in the Spring 2017 semester in ART 200 Foundation Portfolio Review CANVAS videos and content that featured acceptable and unfavorable writing examples of works. | Target Not Met. Continue Actions. |
| | 3.1 (SLO) | Students will effectively display the combination and synthesis of ideas and the experience of | Students participating in ART 300 Seminar: Process to Synthesis | The average score of ART 300 students' written papers will be at least a "2" on the 0- | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | We are pleased that the Target was Met for this outcome. As we evaluate the | Target Met. Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 3.1 (SLO) | working in an imaginative way as students create a body of art through the completion of a written assignment in ART 300 Seminar: Process to Synthesis course. | will be assigned a written paper where they can express creative thinking as a response to generating a coherent body of work. It will be evaluated with the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric. The instructor of the course will assess each student submissions. | 4 scale evaluated with the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | data, 8 students completed the required document with a total average score of 2.93. For each question on the AAC&U Rubric the following average was documented: Acquiring Competencies-3.18; Taking Risks-3.62; Solving Problems-2.56; Embracing Contradictions-3.06; Innovative Thinking-2.62; and Snthesizing-2.56. The professor of the course should be commended for creating course content that addresses this important outcome. Responding to the data, he wishes to address the two lowest scored areas: Solving Problems and Synthesis via added unit content. He also plans to emphasize, on the studio created projects, content and synthesis rather than the actual completed piece. | Target Met. Continue Actions. |
| | 3.2 (GEO 5.a.) | Students will effectively demonstrate the ability to transfer education strands to their major fields of study and to | Students participating in the annual ArtWeek collaborative public artmaking | The average score of those participating in ArtWeek will be at least a "2.5" on the 0-4 scale evaluated with | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | This outcome assessment proved quite challenging due to the nature of the ArtWeek | Target Met. Will make modifications and continue on-line survey and Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 3.2 (GEO 5.a.) | make connections between disciplines through the participation on a team during the ArtWeek collaborative public artmaking experience. | experience will be assigned a written reflection about their contribution and complete a peer review survey of their teammate's efforts. Also each faculty team advisor will keep a record of each individual team members' contributions. These three sources will be combined and evaluated using the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. Each group's faculty team advisors will assess the student submissions. | the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | structure - with students from multiple courses arranged in groups working in various areas in the department over several days. As we began it was apparent that due to the open structure and the time limitations that a written reflection and peer review from each student was not possible. Faced with this dilemma, it was decided to adopt an online survey, Survey Monkey, to address the assessment needs. This proved a success with a good sampling of students willing to participate in a convenient and direct way using their phones. The Survey Monkey questions were tailored to adapt to the AAC&U Teamwork rubric. It was determined that when scoring the assessment that we needed to align the percentages on the survey with the 0-4 rubric scale as well as the survey questions with the | Target Met. Will make modifications and continue on-line survey and Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 3.2 (GEO 5.a.) | Students will effectively demonstrate the ability to transfer education strands to their major fields of study and to make connections between disciplines through the participation on a team during the ArtWeek collaborative public artmaking experience. | Students participating in the annual ArtWeek collaborative public artmaking experience will be assigned a written reflection about their contribution and complete a peer review survey of their teammate's efforts. Also each faculty team advisor will keep a record of each individual team members' contributions. These three sources will be combined and evaluated using the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. Each group's faculty team advisors will assess the student submissions. | The average score of those participating in ArtWeek will be at least a "2.5" on the 0-4 scale evaluated with the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | teamwork categories. The faculty decided that a score of 4 was equal to 90%, 3 equal to 80%, 2, equal to 70% and 1 would be above 50%. For the categories to survey questions dilemma, we chose the following: Was Everyone Engaged in the Design Process corresponded to Fosters Constructive Team Climate; How did the Group Share Design Ideas connects with Contributes to Team Meetings; Considering My Teammates, How well did we work together connects to Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members; About your Contribution to the Team, How well did you do connects to Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings; and How did you and your teammates handle any conflicts, misunderstandings or disagreements corresponds to Responds to | Target Met. Will make modifications and continue on-line survey and Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|--|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 3.2 (GEO 5.a.) | Students will effectively demonstrate the ability to transfer education strands to their major fields of study and to make connections between disciplines through the participation on a team during the ArtWeek collaborative public artmaking experience. | Students participating in the annual ArtWeek collaborative public artmaking experience will be assigned a written reflection about their contribution and complete a peer review survey of their teammate's efforts. Also each faculty team advisor will keep a record of each individual team members' contributions. These three sources will be combined and evaluated using the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. Each group's faculty team advisors will assess the student submissions. | The average score of those participating in ArtWeek will be at least a "2.5" on the 0-4 scale evaluated with the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Conflict. Following this plan, the data is as follows: Contributes to Team Meetings – 87.5% or 3; Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members - 92.5% or 4; Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings – 96.2% or 4; Fosters Constructive Team Climate -84.5% or 3; and Responds to Conflict -100% - 4. If acceptable, we wish to continue using this online survey form, with modifications, as an indirect method of assessing teamwork. | Target Met. Will make modifications and continue on-line survey and Continue Actions. |
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Students enrolled in the ART 313 Modern and Contemporary Art course will be assessed according to the take-home essay portion of their final exam. In this essay, students will be required to compare and contrast the works of four 20th-century artists in terms of their artistic significance and influence on later art or artists. | Using the Art History rubric, students will be assessed as to how well they defended their thesis statement by discussing a) the external historical context that affected the production of each artist's body of work; b) the artistic movement to which the artist belonged; c) the stylistic advancements made by each artist; and | The average score of ART 313 students' essays will be at least 2.5 or better using the Art History rubric. A separate rubric would be completed for each artist and then averaged. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | The class fell short of the target, with an overall average of 2.19. The students were comparing and contrasting the significance of Picasso, Matisse, and Duchamp. The class average for Duchamp was 2.32, with Picasso at 2.17 and Matisse at 2.07. As we interpret the results, part of the problem with this assessment was the | Target Not Met, will Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Students enrolled in the ART 313 Modern and Contemporary Art course will be assessed according to the take-home essay portion of their final exam. In this essay, students will be required to compare and contrast the works of four 20th-century artists in terms of their artistic significance and influence on later art or artists. | d) the aesthetic impact made by each artist to a later generation of artists. | The average score of ART 313 students' essays will be at least 2.5 or better using the Art History rubric. A separate rubric would be completed for each artist and then averaged. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | newness of the rubric. Aspects of the rubric did not fully comply with the essay instructions. Other shortcomings may have resulted from the lack of time for preparation—the essay question was assigned only one week prior to the deadline. Another factor may be the lack of effort on the part of the student. The Art Historian plans to improve scoring on the experience of this assessment rubric, by making the following adjustments for next year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the rubric to be more precise in what is expected. • Share the rubric with the students ahead of time so that they know how they will be assessed. • Use the rubric both as the assessment tool and as the grading rubric for that part of the final exam. Note that the revised target appears to be lower than original. It actually is not— | Target Not Met, will Continue Actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|--|--|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Students enrolled in the ART 313 Modern and Contemporary Art course will be assessed according to the take-home essay portion of their final exam. In this essay, students will be required to compare and contrast the works of four 20th-century artists in terms of their artistic significance and influence on later art or artists. | Using the Art History rubric, students will be assessed as to how well they defended their thesis statement by discussing a) the external historical context that affected the production of each artist's body of work; b) the artistic movement to which the artist belonged; c) the stylistic advancements made by each artist; and d) the aesthetic impact made by each artist to a later generation of artists. | The average score of ART 313 students' essays will be at least 2.5 or better using the Art History rubric. A separate rubric would be completed for each artist and then averaged. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | the original fell between "attempts expectations" and "fulfills expectations." The revised version does the same. Using the rubric as a grading tool required the "does not meet expectations" category to be lowered to a score of "0" as opposed to the original "1". Additional information will be attached to the grading component (penalties for poor writing skills, not following required length, etc.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with students throughout the year on how to write about an artist's influences and historical context. Right now, we work on the artist's significance but less on the historical context. Assign the essay earlier in the semester. | Target Not Met, will Continue Actions. |
| | 5.1 (SAO) | Students successfully complete the capstone Senior Exhibition. | Students are required to complete a Senior Exhibition as part of ART 499 Concept to Exhibition: Senior Seminar, the | The average score of students assessed will be at least 4 "meets expectations" out of the six total areas using the departmental Senior | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | We are glad we Met the Target. This outcome features data collected from 14 students- Fall 2016 (5 students) and Spring 2017 (9 | Target Met, will Continue Actions with modifications. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|---------------------------|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 5.1 (SAO) | Students successfully complete the capstone Senior Exhibition. | department's capstone course. The Senior Exhibition is a professional group show of graduating students which presents a body of artwork that is aesthetically coherent, professionally presented, and of an advanced quality. Selecting works, completing final projects, and designing the exhibition are addressed and are evaluated by the departmental Senior Exhibition Review rubric. The Art and Design faculty will assess each student. | Exhibition Review rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | students) who participated in the Senior Capstone Exhibition with the Total Average for both being - 6.3785 well above the 4 score we were seeking. The breakdown for both semesters Total Averages are as follows: Question 1 Technical Mastery- 1.3094; Question 2 Independent Body of Work- 1.45385; Question 3 Problem Solving in Layout- 1.4285; Question 4 Unified Artistic Goals- 1.375 ; and Question 5 Communicate in the Artist Statement- 1.10775. One area that concerns the department is Question 3 about exhibiting the ability to solve problems independently in the layout and display of works. The faculty felt that this is problematic- and should be reviewed by the instructor of the course alone since we have no way to determine if the works were hung by the student alone or with the help of | Target Met, will Continue Actions with modifications. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 5.1 (SAO) | Students successfully complete the capstone Senior Exhibition. | Students are required to complete a Senior Exhibition as part of ART 499 Concept to Exhibition: Senior Seminar, the department's capstone course. The Senior Exhibition is a professional group show of graduating students which presents a body of artwork that is aesthetically coherent, professionally presented, and of an advanced quality. Selecting works, completing final projects, and designing the exhibition are addressed and are evaluated by the departmental Senior Exhibition Review rubric. The Art and Design faculty will assess each student. | The average score of students assessed will be at least 4 "meets expectations" out of the six total areas using the departmental Senior Exhibition Review rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | others. | Target Met, will Continue Actions with modifications. |
| | | | Students participating in ART 499 Concept to Exhibition: Senior Seminar will be given the Senior Exit Survey to indirectly evaluate their learning, experience as a student, and provide the department with | 75% of participating students will score "Satisfied" on the Senior Exit Survey. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | This outcome features data collected from 14 students- Fall 2016 (5 students) and Spring 2017 (9 students) who participated in the Senior Capstone Exhibition the Exit Surveys with a Total Average Score: 4.65. | Target Met, will Continue with Actions with modifications. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | | data for evaluating effectiveness. The department faculty will evaluate the surveys. | 75% of participating students will score "Satisfied" on the Senior Exit Survey. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | This Met our Target results shows we are doing a good job in meeting the perception of satisfaction within the department. Questions 9 (dealing with engagement in the department) and 10 (connecting with students via social media) proved to cause issues of misinterpretation and should either be changed or eliminated from future surveys. For both classes the one that scored 5 was question 11 about the ability to create independent and original artwork in the department. | Target Met, will Continue with Actions with modifications. |
| | 6.1 (PO 2.d.) | The Mississippi University for Women Galleries will contribute to the creative economy of the university community by offering a diverse and engaging series of annual exhibitions. | Visitors to the Mississippi University for Women Galleries will be asked to complete the MUW Galleries Assessment Survey questionnaire. The focus will be on reception attendees. Using a gallery rubric, gallery visitors will assess their level of engagement or satisfaction with the exhibitions on | 70% of attendees surveyed will choose "satisfactory" with the exhibitions by scoring an average of "3" or higher using the MUW Galleries Assessment Survey. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The department was pleased that we surpassed our target score with 100% of the visitors scored their experience a "3" or above. Out of 36 respondents, 29 (81%) scored their experience at "5," 6 (17%) scored it at "4", and 1 (2%) scored it at "3". One outcome is that the Gallery Director wishes to get more feedback from visitors in the | Target Met, will Continue Actions with modifications. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 6.1 (PO 2.d.) | The Mississippi University for Women Galleries will contribute to the creative economy of the university community by offering a diverse and engaging series of annual exhibitions. | display. Rubrics will be updated with every change of exhibition. The other information on the assessment measurement questionnaire will be used to determine demographics. The MUW Galleries Assessment Survey questionnaire and all pertaining data will be assessed by the Gallery Director and gallery staff members. | 70% of attendees surveyed will choose "satisfactory" with the exhibitions by scoring an average of "3" or higher using the MUW Galleries Assessment Survey. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | future, since the assessment book in unobtrusive place—perhaps too out of the way. The gallery staff announces at receptions that we would like for visitors to complete the survey, but this has been intrusive and unproductive. The gallery staff plans to experiment with placing assessment forms in all of the galleries as a way to get more feedback. Anything else would be too intrusive and disruptive of the visitors' experience. It is generally accepted that all exhibition sites (not just ours) experience low assessment survey | Target Met, will Continue Actions with modifications. |
| Program - French - Minor {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will enhance aural skills in French through the use of technological resources. | Students will demonstrate increased aural skills in French after listening or watching films, excerpts from audio-magazines, websites, and video-clips in French. French faculty will assess with the Aural Comprehension Rubric. | 70% of non-French minors enrolled in FLF 100 or 200 level French classes will exhibit at least a "minimum understanding" after listening to an audio-clip or being shown a video-clip in French. The Aural Comprehension Rubric will measure aural skills from a range of "no understanding" to | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Of the 43 non-French minor students (we have one declared minor) who completed one of the five French Classes offered during the academic year (FLF 101, 102, 201, 202 & 203), only seven of them scored "no understanding" on the French Aural Comprehension | We will continue to apply to French Aural Comprehension Rubric to all non-minors who take FLF 101, 102, 201, 202, & 203. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Program - French - Minor {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will enhance aural skills in French through the use of technological resources. | Students will demonstrate increased aural skills in French after listening or watching films, excerpts from audio-magazines, websites, and video-clips in French. French faculty will assess with the Aural Comprehension Rubric. | "minimum understanding" to "proficient understanding" to "exemplary understanding." | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Rubric. The remaining 37 scored at least "minimum understanding." on the department rubric, or 86%. | We will continue to apply to French Aural Comprehension Rubric to all non-minors who take FLF 101, 102, 201, 202, & 203. |
| | | | Students will demonstrate increased aural skills in French after listening or watching films, excerpts from audio-magazines, websites, and video-clips in French. French faculty will assess with the Aural Comprehension Rubric. | 70% of non-French minors enrolled in FLF 100 or 200 level French classes will exhibit at least a "minimum understanding" after listening to an audio-clip or being shown a video-clip in French. The Aural Comprehension Rubric will measure aural skills from a range of "no understanding" to "minimum understanding" to "proficient understanding" to "exemplary understanding." | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Of the 43 non-minor students (we have one French minor) who completed FLF 101, 102, 201, 202 or 203 this academic year, 37, or 86 percent scored at least "minimum understanding" on the department rubric after listening to an audio-clip or video-clip in French. | We will continue to test aural comprehension of all French students with the department aural comprehension rubric. |
| | | | Students will demonstrate increased aural skills in French after listening or watching films, excerpts from audio-magazines, websites, and video-clips in French. French faculty will | 80% of all French minors enrolled in FLF 100 or 200 level courses will exhibit at least a "proficient understanding" after listening to an audio-clip or being shown a video-clip in French. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | one minor was enrolled in French this year. She exhibited "proficient understanding" in her FLF 201 class. She did not take FLF 202 in the spring. | We will interview the French minor who decided not to take FLF 202 in the spring in order to find out why she is delaying her BA requirement. In addition, since she dropped the minor in June, 2017, we will find out why she decided not to continue as a minor. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | assess with the Aural Comprehension Rubric. | The Aural Comprehension Rubric will measure aural skills from a range of "no understanding" to "minimum understanding" to "proficient understanding" to "exemplary understanding." | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | one minor was enrolled in French this year. She exhibited "proficient understanding" in her FLF 201 class. She did not take FLF 202 in the spring. | We will interview the French minor who decided not to take FLF 202 in the spring in order to find out why she is delaying her BA requirement. In addition, since she dropped the minor in June, 2017, we will find out why she decided not to continue as a minor. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 2.c.) | French students enrolled in FLF 100 and 200 level courses will demonstrate knowledge about the variety of cultures in French speaking countries. | A French faculty member will assess a written or oral student presentation dealing with cultural aspects of a French speaking country using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. | All French minors will average at least the following on the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. In FLF 101 – no lower than 1.5 In FLF 102 – no lower than 2.0 In FLF 201 – no lower than 2.5 In FLF 202 – no lower than 3 (lower Capstone level) | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | One French minor took FLF 201 this year and scored a 2.6 on the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric after an assignment including a presentation on an aspect of culture in a French speaking country. | We will continue to use this AAC&U Value Rubric to assess French minor's cultural knowledge. |
| | | | A French faculty member will assess a written or oral student presentation dealing with cultural aspects of a French speaking country using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. | All students taking FLF 100 and 200 level classes (excluding French minors) will average collectively at least the following on the AAC&U VALUE Rubric Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. In FLF 101 – no lower than 1 In FLF 102 – no lower than 1.5 In FLF 201 – no lower than 2.0 In FLF 202 – no lower than 2.5 | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Of the 14 students taking FLF 101 this year, all scored no lower than 1 on the VALUE rubric. Of the 13 students taking FLF 102 this year, only three scored below a 1.5, but the class collectively averaged was a 2. Of the 9 students taking FLF 201 this year, three scored below a 2.0, but the class collectively averaged was 2.2. | We will continue to apply this rubric to a student oral presentation on some aspect of a French speaking Country. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|-----------------|--|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | A French faculty member will assess a written or oral student presentation dealing with cultural aspects of a French speaking country using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. | | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Of the 4 students taking FLF 202 this year, all four scored above a 2.5. Of the 3 students taking FLF 203 in the summer of 2016, one scored a 0, bringing the collectively class average down below the target of 2.5. However, the two other individuals scored well above 2.5. | We will continue to apply this rubric to a student oral presentation on some aspect of a French speaking Country. |
| | 2.2 (PO 4.d.) | Minors who complete a minor in our foreign language program will demonstrate satisfaction with the instruction and of the program's intercultural and multicultural knowledge emphasis. | The Alumni Survey is sent out every three years. The next survey will be in 2019. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. Since French minors are rare, this every third year assessment should be sufficient to determine program success. | 75% of students participating in the Alumni Survey will state that they were satisfied with the instruction received in their minor program, and gained a greater appreciation overall of global culture, including the varied cultures of French speaking countries. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The alumni survey will not be sent out again until 2019 | We have one French minor, but have healthy enrollment in the 100 and 200 level classes. Students will continue to take these classes for BA and Honors requirements. |
| | 3.1 (SAO & SLO) | Students will have a five to ten minute one on one conversation in French with a French faculty member as a part of the assessment of student learning in FLF 101, 102, 201 and 202. The | A French faculty member will assess a five to ten minute conversation between himself and each student enrolled in FLF 101, 102, 201 and 202 (or | 70% of non-French minors taking the following FLF elementary and intermediate French courses will score the following averages on the departmental | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | No student in FLF 101 scored below a "minimal" on the conversation rubric in the final exam one on one conversation. Two students in FLF | We will consider raising the Achievement percentage by ten points, since such a high percentage of students far exceeded the target percentage. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 3.1 (SAO & SLO) | Departmental Conversation Rubric will be applied to the conversation. | the summer intensive courses*) Department Conversation Rubric. | conversation rubric. In FLF 101 – no lower than an average of “minimal” In FLF 102 – no lower than an average of “minimal” In FLF 201 – no lower than an average of “proficient” In FLF 202 – no lower than an average of “proficient” | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 102 scored lower than minimal on the conversation rubric in the final exam one on one conversation. One student in FLF 201 scored below "proficient" on the conversation rubric in the final exam one on one conversation. No students in FLF 202 scored below "proficient" on the conversation rubric in the final exam one on one conversation. One student in FLF 203 scored below "proficient" on the conversation rubric in the final exam one on one conversation. | We will consider raising the Achievement percentage by ten points, since such a high percentage of students far exceeded the target percentage. |
| | | | A French faculty member will assess a five to ten minute conversation between himself and each student enrolled in FLF 101, 102, 201 and 202 (or the summer intensive courses*) Department Conversation Rubric. | 90% of French minors taking the following FLF elementary and intermediate French courses will score the following averages on the Department Conversation Rubric. In FLF 101 – no lower than an average of “minimal” In FLF 102 – no lower than an average of “minimal” In FLF 201 – no lower than an average of “proficient” In FLF 202 – no lower | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | one minor took FLF 201 in this academic year. She scored above proficient on her one on one conversation. | We will continue to apply the conversation rubric to the final oral exam in every FLF class. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|--------------|---|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | | | A French faculty member will assess a five to ten minute conversation between himself and each student enrolled in FLF 101, 102, 201 and 202 (or the summer intensive courses*) courses using the Department Conversation Rubric. | than an average of "proficient" | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | one minor took FLF 201 in this academic year. She scored above proficient on her one on one conversation. | We will continue to apply the conversation rubric to the final oral exam in every FLF class. |
| Program - History (including Minor and Secondary Education Certification in History and Social Studies) BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Identify and evaluate continuity and change, causality and coincidence, voice and agency (SLO 5). | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year for historical depth to determine if achievement target was met. | 100% of graduating seniors will complete at least 4 lower-level (100 level) history survey courses (12 credit hours) with a passing grade. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Both passed and completed 4 lower-level survey courses in history. | We met our goal this year and plan to continue monitoring students' historical depth through transcript review. |
| | | | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year for historical depth to determine if achievement target was met. | 100% of graduating seniors will complete at least 4 upper- level (either 300 or 400 level) history survey courses (12 credit hours) with a passing grade. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Both passed and completed 4 upper-level courses in history. | We met our goal this year and plan to continue to monitor students' historical depth in history coursework. |
| | 1.2 (SLO) | Relate the complexity of the human experience across time and space (SLO 6). | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year for historical breadth to determine if | 100% of graduating seniors will complete at least one non-western course (3 credit hours) with a passing grade. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Both passed and completed at least one non-western history course. | We met our goal this year and plan to continue monitoring students' historical breadth through transcript review. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 1.2 (SLO) | Relate the complexity of the human experience across time and space (SLO 6). | achievement target was met. | 100% of graduating seniors will complete at least one non-western course (3 credit hours) with a passing grade. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Both passed and completed at least one non-western history course. | We met our goal this year and plan to continue monitoring students' historical breadth through transcript review. |
| | | | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year for historical breadth to determine if achievement target was met. | 100% of graduating seniors will complete at least one pre modern (pre 1500) course (3 credit hours) with a passing grade. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Both passed at least one premodern course. | We met our goal this year and plan to continue monitoring students' historical breadth through transcript review. |
| | | | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year for historical breadth to determine if achievement target was met. | 100% of graduating seniors will complete at least two American history courses (6 credit hours) with a passing grade. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Both passed and completed at least two American history courses. | We met our goal this year and plan to continue monitoring students' historical breadth through transcript review. |
| | | | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year for historical breadth to determine if achievement target was met. | 100% of graduating seniors will complete at least two European history courses (6 credit hours) with a passing grade. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Both passed and completed at least two European history classes. | We met our goal this year and plan to continue monitoring students' historical breadth through transcript review. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.b.) | Interpret and evaluate primary sources carefully and use them to make a historical argument (SLO 1). | The History department faculty will use the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric to assess the Performance Task Assessment required of HIS 211 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 211 students completing the Performance Task Assessment will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | HIS 311 was changed to HIS 211, but the mission and teaching in the class remains the same. The Performance Task Assessment was required of each student and the Critical Thinking Value Rubric was applied to each individual student's assessment in Fall 2016. Overall, average for the class was a 3.30. Of the five items assessed by the Value Rubric, students performed best at an "explanation of issues" and performed slightly less well at in the other categories. Although, it is important to note, that the class average was above 3 in each of the five categories of the Value Rubric. | We are satisfied with the Performance Task Assessment and feel it is doing a good job of documenting and demonstrating students' grasp of critical thinking. We intend to continue its use and stress critical thinking ability in the HIS 211 course. |
| | 3.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will successfully communicate ideas clearly and professionally in oral and written formats. | The History department faculty will use the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the Research Presentation required of HIS 211 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 211 students completing the Research Presentation will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | In Fall 2016 students in HIS 211 were required to complete an oral presentation on a research topic of their choice. Faculty used the Oral Communication Value Rubric to assess student performance. The | Faculty will discuss the HIS 211 (formerly 311) oral presentation performance at their department meeting in August. Faculty teaching HIS 211 will dedicate more time to preparation for oral presentations and will circulate a "how to turn your paper into speech" best practices guideline for the other faculty to use. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 3.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will successfully communicate ideas clearly and professionally in oral and written formats. | The History department faculty will use the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the Research Presentation required of HIS 211 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 211 students completing the Research Presentation will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | overall average for the class using the rubric was 2.92. This put the class just below the 3.0 target. Students performed especially poorly in two specific categories of the rubric: "Language" and "Central Message". In the other three categories for the rubric, they were at the target of 3 or above. | Faculty will discuss the HIS 211 (formerly 311) oral presentation performance at their department meeting in August. Faculty teaching HIS 211 will dedicate more time to preparation for oral presentations and will circulate a "how to turn your paper into speech" best practices guideline for the other faculty to use. |
| | | | The History department faculty will use the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric to assess the Research Paper required of HIS 499 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 499 students completing the Research Paper will be no lower than a 3.0 on the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In Fall 2016 students in HIS 499 were required to complete an original research project that included an essay or paper of significant length. Faculty used the Historical Inquiry Rubric to assess student performance. The overall average for the class using the rubric was 3.22. This put the class above the 3.0 target and every individual assessed was above that target. | Students did well at engaging primary sources, but the faculty person reported that students seemed to have a harder time placing their individual projects and primary sources in a larger context. This means that they had a difficult time articulating the historical significance of their study and situating it within a field of scholarship. The second point made by the faculty was that the students often did have good time management skills and fell behind even in the beginning of the semester. Faculty will discuss these issues at the department meeting at the beginning of the year. More frequent and regular meeting times with Capstone students might help them manage their time. |
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Locate and select a variety of historical sources (primary, secondary, archival, library, electronic, etc.) for use in an historical | The History department faculty will determine HIS 211 students' competency by reviewing the | The overall average of HIS 211 students for the Library and Archive Source assignment(s) will be no lower than a C (75 | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In Fall 2016, faculty teaching HIS 211 required the Library and Archive Source Assignment. Of the students in the | Faculty will continue to require the Library and Source Assignment and monitor performance on the assignment. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 4.1 (SLO) | argument (SLO 2). | completed Library and Archive Source assignment(s) (fall). | percent). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | class, the overall average for the assignment was 93%, far above the 75% target. | Faculty will continue to require the Library and Source Assignment and monitor performance on the assignment. |
| | 4.2 (SLO) | Students will successfully understand, synthesize, and engage with the ideas of others and accept and/or resolve differing perspectives or conflicting evidence responsibly. | The History department faculty will use the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric to assess the Research Paper required of HIS 499 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 499 students completing the Research Paper will be no lower than a 3.0 on the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In the Fall 2016 HIS 499 class, students' research papers were assessed with the Historical, Inquiry, Argument, and Writing Rubric (HIAWR). The overall average of all the students in the class for HIAWR overall was 3.14. The results for each of the seven aspects of the rubric were more complicated, however. In "student frames historical questions" and "student demonstrates awareness of interpretive differences" the class average fell below 3.0 . The class average far exceeded 3.0 in "student evaluates and analyzes primary sources." This seems to indicate that students do well at the basic task of the historian--analyzing primary sources-- but struggle with the upper-level critical thinking | We are satisfied with the student performance on the Capstone Research Paper as evaluated with the HIAWR and will continue to monitor their performance. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 4.2 (SLO) | Students will successfully understand, synthesize, and engage with the ideas of others and accept and/or resolve differing perspectives or conflicting evidence responsibly. | The History department faculty will use the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric to assess the Research Paper required of HIS 499 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 499 students completing the Research Paper will be no lower than a 3.0 on the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | required to frame and interpret differences. | We are satisfied with the student performance on the Capstone Research Paper as evaluated with the HIAWR and will continue to monitor their performance. |
| | 4.3 (SLO) | Students will successfully develop a historical argument that uses ample evidence (primary and secondary) to support its claims. | The History department faculty will use the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric to assess the Research Paper required of HIS 499 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 499 students completing the Research Paper will be no lower than a 3.0 on the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In the Fall 2016 HIS 499 class, students' research papers were assessed with the Historical, Inquiry, Argument, and Writing Rubric (HIAWR). The overall average of all the students in the class for HIAWR overall was 3.14. The results for each of the seven aspects of the rubric were more complicated, however. In "student frames historical questions" and "student demonstrates awareness of interpretive differences" the class average fell below 3.0. The class average far exceeded 3.0 in "student evaluates and analyzes primary sources." This seems to indicate that students do well at the basic task of the | Faculty will discuss the results of the HIAWR in the Capstone and look for ways to improve the upper-level thinking needed to frame and interpret differences, both in HIS 211 Methods and HIS 499 Capstone. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 4.3 (SLO) | Students will successfully develop a historical argument that uses ample evidence (primary and secondary) to support its claims. | The History department faculty will use the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric to assess the Research Paper required of HIS 499 students (fall). | The overall average score for HIS 499 students completing the Research Paper will be no lower than a 3.0 on the departmental Historical Inquiry and Argument Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | historian--analyzing primary sources--but struggle with the upper-level critical thinking required to frame and interpret differences. | Faculty will discuss the results of the HIAWR in the Capstone and look for ways to improve the upper-level thinking needed to frame and interpret differences, both in HIS 211 Methods and HIS 499 Capstone. |
| | 5.1 (SAO) | Students in the Capstone course will successfully show improvement in their knowledge and skills in the areas of historical content, critical thinking, communication, and inquiry. | The History departmental faculty will analyze the HIS 499 students' results from the Capstone Survey that asks the degree to which their knowledge and skills improved in historical content, critical thinking, communication, and inquiry (fall). | The overall average for HIS 499 students completing the Capstone Survey will be that students report seeing an increase of at least "3.0" on a 1-5 Likert scale, regarding the degree to which their knowledge and skills improved in historical content, critical thinking, communication, and inquiry. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In Fall 2016 history faculty emailed the Capstone survey to the 4 students in the class. One responded to the survey. In that one response, the overall average for all questions on the survey was a 4.8. That one student certainly believed their knowledge and skills had improved; however, the larger problem is that only one student responded to the survey. | The faculty teaching HIS 499 need to make sure that the survey is given during class, when students are assembled, and not rely on email distribution and return of the survey (which is clearly ineffective). History faculty will discuss this at the first department meeting in August 2017. |
| | 6.1 (PO 2.e.) | History majors will complete an internship or study abroad program before graduating. | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year to determine if students have completed an internship or study abroad program. | 70 percent of History majors who graduated in the previous year will have completed an internship or study abroad program. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students graduated in August, December, or May 2016-7 with a history degree. Only one completed an internship/Study Abroad. However, the other student was graduated as history with teacher certification, which requires a lot more hours in the major and might have | Whether we met our goal this year is questionable, but with only two students and one of them being history with teacher certification, our ability to measure whether most students are completing an internship or Study Abroad was hampered. In the end, if you count the teacher internship, both did complete internships. And the non-teacher cert student completed two internships and a Study Abroad semester. We want to continue to monitor students' completion of internships and |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|---|---|--|------------------|--------------|---|---|
| | 6.1 (PO 2.e.) | History majors will complete an internship or study abroad program before graduating. | At the end of the spring semester, the department chair will review transcripts of graduating seniors for the previous year to determine if students have completed an internship or study abroad program. | 70 percent of History majors who graduated in the previous year will have completed an internship or study abroad program. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | prohibited the student from selecting a more traditional internship. Overall, with only two students graduating, it is hard to draw conclusions from such a limited sample. | Study Abroad. |
| | 7.1 (SLO) | Students will demonstrate best practices regarding lesson preparation, lesson delivery, and classroom management. | At the end of the fall semester, the instructor for HIS 410 Methods and Materials in Secondary History and Social Studies will review student work and grades and determine whether the achievement target was met. | 100% of students in HIS 410 will complete the class with an average grade of C (70 %) or above. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | There were no students enrolled in HIS 410 in the fall semester, so no data was collected regarding student's ability to demonstrate best practices in teacher preparation. | No actions will be taken, as we are not losing future history teachers, they are just opting for the alternate route, which does not include the same teacher preparation curriculum. |
| | 7.2 (SLO) | Students will demonstrate success regarding supervised teaching in local schools. | At the end of the spring semester, the Social Studies Teacher Certification Coordinator will review the Teacher Intern Assessment Instrument (TIAI) metric of student teachers enrolled in ED 409 Observation and Directed Teaching in Secondary Education Grades 7-12 during the academic year that is ending. The TIAI measures six facets of teaching, which are: (1) planning and | 100% of student teachers will receive a 2 or above evaluation from the mentor teacher on the TIAI metric (on a 0-3 scale). | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | There were no students enrolled in ED 409 in the fall or spring semester, so no data was collected regarding student's ability to demonstrate success regarding student teaching. | No actions will be taken, as we are not losing future history teachers, they are just opting for the alternate route, which does not require a student teaching internship. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|--------------|---|--|--|------------------|--------------|--|--|
| | 7.2 (SLO) | Students will demonstrate success regarding supervised teaching in local schools. | preparation, (2) communication and interaction, (3) teaching for learning, (4) managing the learning environment, (5) assessment of student learning, and (6) professionalism and partnerships. Each student teacher receives an overall score from the mentor teacher related to their performance on the six areas, and the final score is on a 0-3 scale. The coordinator will compile the scores and determine whether the achievement target was met. | 100% of student teachers will receive a 2 or above evaluation from the mentor teacher on the TIAI metric (on a 0-3 scale). | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | There were no students enrolled in ED 409 in the fall or spring semester, so no data was collected regarding student's ability to demonstrate success regarding student teaching. | No actions will be taken, as we are not losing future history teachers, they are just opting for the alternate route, which does not require a student teaching internship. |
| Program - Interdisciplinary Studies (including American, International, and Medieval/Renaissance Studies Minors) - BA, BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will explore and analyze issues, ideas, and/or events in a way that serves an ultimately academic purpose. | The faculty members making up individual student research committees in IS 499 will use the AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric to assess the Capstone project in IS 499. Student effort on the IS 499 paper will produce at least an average score of "3" for each of the six items measured in the rubric: topic | The average score for all students in IS 499 completing the Capstone project will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Between fall and spring 2016-7, five students completed IS 499 Capstone. Each of their faculty committee members individually scored them using the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric to evaluate their research essay and presentation. The students averaged 3.52 across all categories of the | HPG faculty have already begun a discussion of whether all disciplines work well with the IS major. Students scored far above 3.0 overall on the Inquiry and Analysis Rubric but lowest in the category of "design process." Because IS students do not have a "home" in anyone discipline and take intensive coursework in two or three, they may not be as familiar with a discipline's specific design model. In some disciplines, like marketing, this is more problematic than others, like English. Faculty will discuss ways to help students with design model at the August |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| Program - Interdisciplinary Studies (including American, International, and Medieval/Renaissance Studies Minors) - BA, BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will explore and analyze issues, ideas, and/or events in a way that serves an ultimately academic purpose. | selection; existing knowledge, research, and/or views; design process; analysis; conclusions; limitations and implications. Direct, summative assessment is accomplished through analysis of a student's independent research project completed in IS 499 Interdisciplinary Studies Capstone. This course is normally taken in the student's last semester. A IS 499 student develops an idea for a comprehensive project that meaningfully combines aspects of the two to three disciplines he/she has chosen for the IS major. The student selects a faculty committee (representing each discipline), and the committee works with the IS adviser to keep the student on track over the semester in developing a finished product that is analytical but | The average score for all students in IS 499 completing the Capstone project will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | rubric, scoring best in "existing knowledge, research, and/or views" and "analysis" and scoring least well in "design process". In all categories but "design process" students were above the 3.0 target. | department meeting. Ultimately, we may need to consider reducing the number of disciplines IS students can concentrate in, removing disciplines that require an extensive background in design modeling or experiment design. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| Program - Interdisciplinary Studies (including American, International, and Medieval/Renaissance Studies Minors) - BA, BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will explore and analyze issues, ideas, and/or events in a way that serves an ultimately academic purpose. | which may also include creative elements appropriate to the disciplines included. At the very foundation of the course is a paper, usually 20 pages in length that adheres to the goals and standards of academic research. The committee provides guidance to the student through stages spaced out during the semester: prospectus; annotated bibliography; initial draft; second draft; final draft. A couple days after submitting the final draft, the student orally presents his/her project to the committee. This encounter also allows committee members to probe areas needing further clarification and to make recommendations about how the student may proceed in the possible further development of the project. Assessment data will be collected from all faculty committee members, whose | The average score for all students in IS 499 completing the Capstone project will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Between fall and spring 2016-7, five students completed IS 499 Capstone. Each of their faculty committee members individually scored them using the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric to evaluate their research essay and presentation. The students averaged 3.52 across all categories of the rubric, scoring best in "existing knowledge, research, and/or views" and "analysis" and scoring least well in "design process". In all categories but "design process" students were above the 3.0 target. | HPG faculty have already begun a discussion of whether all disciplines work well with the IS major. Students scored far above 3.0 overall on the Inquiry and Analysis Rubric but lowest in the category of "design process." Because IS students do not have a "home" in anyone discipline and take intensive coursework in two or three, they may not be as familiar with a discipline's specific design model. In some disciplines, like marketing, this is more problematic than others, like English. Faculty will discuss ways to help students with design model at the August department meeting. Ultimately, we may need to consider reducing the number of disciplines IS students can concentrate in, removing disciplines that require an extensive background in design modeling or experiment design. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| Program - Interdisciplinary Studies (including American, International, and Medieval/Renaissance Studies Minors) - BA, BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will explore and analyze issues, ideas, and/or events in a way that serves an ultimately academic purpose. | scores will be averaged for the final result. | The average score for all students in IS 499 completing the Capstone project will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Inquiry and Analysis VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Between fall and spring 2016-7, five students completed IS 499 Capstone. Each of their faculty committee members individually scored them using the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric to evaluate their research essay and presentation. The students averaged 3.52 across all categories of the rubric, scoring best in "existing knowledge, research, and/or views" and "analysis" and scoring least well in "design process". In all categories but "design process" students were above the 3.0 target. | HPG faculty have already begun a discussion of whether all disciplines work well with the IS major. Students scored far above 3.0 overall on the Inquiry and Analysis Rubric but lowest in the category of "design process." Because IS students do not have a "home" in anyone discipline and take intensive coursework in two or three, they may not be as familiar with a discipline's specific design model. In some disciplines, like marketing, this is more problematic than others, like English. Faculty will discuss ways to help students with design model at the August department meeting. Ultimately, we may need to consider reducing the number of disciplines IS students can concentrate in, removing disciplines that require an extensive background in design modeling or experiment design. |
| | 1.2 (SLO) | Students will report that the courses they took for their interdisciplinary program caused them to evaluate and analyze diverse issues, ideas, and/or events across various traditional academic disciplines while making connections between those disciplines. | The department chair will administer the Interdisciplinary Inquiry and Analysis Survey to all senior IS minors in American Studies, Medieval & Renaissance Studies, and International Studies in the spring semester. The survey is scored on a 5-point Likert scale. | The average score for all surveyed IS minor students on the Interdisciplinary Inquiry and Analysis Survey will be no lower than 3.0 out of a possible 5.0. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In Spring 2017, there were three seniors with an IS minor. Only two returned the completed Inquiry and Analysis Survey. Of the two, the survey average for all questions was 4.4. Senior students who responded clearly thought curriculum for the minor helped them | The problem for the survey continues to be getting students to respond to it. Since there is no one class that all IS minors take, not even a shared class that all American Studies or Med/Ren Studies students take, the faculty must rely on email communication to distribute and collect the IS survey. Response rate will likely be low as long as this continues. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 1.2 (SLO) | Students will report that the courses they took for their interdisciplinary program caused them to evaluate and analyze diverse issues, ideas, and/or events across various traditional academic disciplines while making connections between those disciplines. | The department chair will administer the Interdisciplinary Studies Minors Inquiry and Analysis Survey to all senior IS minors in American Studies, Medieval & Renaissance Studies, and International Studies in the spring semester. The survey is scored on a 5-point Likert scale. | The average score for all surveyed IS minor students on the Interdisciplinary Studies Minors Inquiry and Analysis Survey will be no lower than 3.0 out of a possible 5.0. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | become more inquiry-driven and better analytical thinkers. | The problem for the survey continues to be getting students to respond to it. Since there is no one class that all IS minors take, not even a shared class that all American Studies or Med/Ren Studies students take, the faculty must rely on email communication to distribute and collect the IS survey. Response rate will likely be low as long as this continues. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate effective context and purpose for writing, content development, genre and disciplinary conventions, source and evidence use, and control of syntax and mechanics. | Faculty committee members for each student enrolled in IS 499 will utilize the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the written portion of the student's Capstone project. This course is normally taken in the student's last semester. | The average score for students enrolled IS 499 completing the Capstone project will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Between fall and spring 2016-7, five students completed IS 499 Capstone. Each of their faculty committee members individually scored them using the Written Communication Value Rubric to evaluate their research essay. The students averaged 3.675 across all categories of the rubric, scoring best in "context and purpose for writing" and scoring least well in "content development". However, this time in all categories students score above 3.0; indeed, their lowest average was in content development at | We will continue to what we're doing to prepare IS students to write and communicate effectively. HPG faculty will discuss the results of this assessment at the August department meeting. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate effective context and purpose for writing, content development, genre and disciplinary conventions, source and evidence use, and control of syntax and mechanics. | Faculty committee members for each student enrolled in IS 499 will utilize the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the written portion of the student's Capstone project. This course is normally taken in the student's last semester. | The average score for students enrolled in IS 499 completing the Capstone project will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 3.375. | We will continue to what we're doing to prepare IS students to write and communicate effectively. HPG faculty will discuss the results of this assessment at the August department meeting. |
| | 3.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will orally communicate the academic value of one's advanced research in an effective manner. | Faculty committee members for each student enrolled in IS 499 will utilize the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the oral portion of the student's Capstone project. This course is normally taken in the student's last semester. | The average score for students enrolled in IS 499 completing the Capstone project will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Between fall and spring 2016-7, five students completed IS 499 Capstone. Each of their faculty committee members individually scored them using the Oral Communication Rubric to evaluate their oral presentations. The students averaged 3.9 across all categories of the rubric. Students scored highly across the board regarding oral presentation skills and in all categories of the rubric. The differences between categories are negligible. | We will continue to stress oral communication ability and prepare students for the presentation in IS 499. HPG faculty will discuss this assessment at the August department meeting. |
| | 4.1 (SAO & PO 3.e.) | Students enrolled in IS 499 will successfully complete their Capstone project, which involves collaborating with faculty | Faculty committee members will determine the final course grades of students enrolled in | 100% of students enrolled in IS 499 Capstone will pass the course. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Between fall and spring 2016-7, five students attempted and successfully completed IS 499 | All IS senior students successfully completed IS 499. HPG faculty will continue to work closely on a weekly basis with IS Capstone students to ensure that this trend |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|---------------------|--|---|---|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | 4.1 (SAO & PO 3.e.) | from multiple academic disciplines in order to intentionally combine those fields into a significant research project focused on the student's interests and academic needs. | IS 499 Capstone. Final grade information will then be compiled by the Interdisciplinary Studies adviser for review and reporting. | 100% of students enrolled in IS 499 Capstone will pass the course. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Capstone. No student dropped, withdrew, or failed the class. | continues. |
| Program - Mathematics (including Minor and Secondary Education Certification) - BA, BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will write concise and clear proofs. | Proofs from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Mathematics Proof Writing Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | 75% of all MA 301 student work sampled at the satisfactory or higher level. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 82% of work sampled in MA 301 was at the satisfactory or higher level. Items assessed: 24 proficient; 12 satisfactory; 8 unsatisfactory. Multiple items assessed for each student in the class. 7 students | Target met. Continue with quality instruction and emphasizing careful and correct use of mathematical language and terminology in learning to write concise and clear proofs. |
| | | | Proofs from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Mathematics Proof Writing Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be | 75% of all MA 304 / MA 455 / MA 461 student work sampled at the proficient level. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | None of these courses was taught in 2016-2017. | Two of these courses will be taught in 2017-2018 as we follow our revised rotation of course offerings. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | evaluated. | 75% of all MA 304 / MA 455 / MA 461 student work sampled at the proficient level. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | None of these courses was taught in 2016-2017. | Two of these courses will be taught in 2017-2018 as we follow our revised rotation of course offerings. |
| | 1.2 (SLO) | Students will interpret concepts and solutions. | Problems from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | 75% of all MA 181 student work sampled at level 2 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 83% of work sampled in MA 181 was at level 2 or higher. 201 items at level 3; 82 items at level 2; 60 items at level 1. Multiple items assessed for each student in the classes. 78 students | Target met. There are challenges related to language for this group of students who are nearly all international students. Many students skip or do not take seriously questions requiring written explanations. |
| | | | Problems from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | 75% of all MA 306 student work sampled at level 2 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 68% of work sampled in MA 306 was at level 2 or higher. 15 items at level 3; 4 items at level 2; 9 items at level 1. Multiple items assessed for each student in the class. 7 students | Target not met. There are challenges related to language for this group of students who are nearly all international students. Many students skip or do not take seriously questions requiring written explanations. Instructor will increase the emphasis on such problems in the next offering in Spring 2019. |
| | 1.3 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will give a sample lesson that presents a problem and | Projects will be evaluated using the Oral Communication | MA 318 / MA 319 student work sampled will have an average | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | Neither of these courses was taught in 2016-2017. | Neither course is anticipated for 2017-2018 due to a lack of declared Mathematics with Teacher |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | 1.3 (GEO 1.c.) | its solution. | VALUE Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | score of 2.5 or higher on the AAC&U Oral Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | Neither of these courses was taught in 2016-2017. | Certification majors. We anticipate needing to offer one of the courses the following year. |
| | 1.4 (SAO) | Students will successfully complete MA 301. MA 301 is the gateway course to many of the upper level MA courses. | Faculty will review semester grades within MA 301. | 75% of all MA 301 students will earn a semester grade of C or better. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 71% of students earned a semester grade of C or better. | Target not met. The percentage of students earning a C or better was close to the target. Early attention to struggling students needs more focus from the instructor, as the use of Early Alert reports was ineffective at even reaching students and/or providing assistance. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 3.a.) | Students will solve application problems. | Problems from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | MA 284 student work sampled will have an average score of 2.5 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | mean = 2.33 39 items at level 3; 15 items at level 2; 16 items at level 1. Multiple items assessed for each student in the class. 7 students | Target not met. The students are primarily international students and language issues add a layer of difficulty to application problems. Many of the students skip the word problems, or don't take them seriously. Instructor plans to give in-class quizzes in Spring 2018. This will increase the emphasis on all material, including application problems, and will give the instructor a better sense of individual abilities which is not always discernible on homework assignments. |
| | | | Problems from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. The primary | MA 306 student work sampled will have an average score of 2.5 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | mean = 2.52 26 items at level 3; 12 items at level 2; 4 items at level 1. Multiple items assessed for each student in the class. | Target met. Continue quality instruction and the incorporation of application problems. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | | | evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | MA 306 student work sampled will have an average score of 2.5 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 7 students | Target met. Continue quality instruction and the incorporation of application problems. |
| | 2.2 (SLO) | Students will combine different mathematical ideas in problem solving. | Problems from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | 50% of all MA 303 / MA 312 / MA 457 / MA 459 student work sampled at level 3 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 57% of work sampled in MA 303 and MA 459 was at level 3 or higher. 24 items at level 3; 14 items at level 2; 4 items at level 1. Multiple items assessed for each student in the class. 8 students (4 students in MA 303 and 4 students in MA 459) | Target met. Continue quality instruction. |
| | | | Problems from assignments and exams will be evaluated using the Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. The primary evaluator will be the course instructor, with possible review by another mathematics faculty member. Due to small classes (less | 90% of all MA 303 / MA 312 / MA 457 / MA 459 student work sampled at level 2 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 90% of work sampled in MA 303 and MA 459 was at level 2 or higher. 24 items at level 3; 14 items at level 2; 4 items at level 1. Multiple items assessed for each student in the class. 8 students (4 students in MA 303 and 4 students in MA 459) | Target met. Continue quality instruction. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|---------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | | | than ten students beyond MA 182), multiple items from each student will be evaluated. | 90% of all MA 303 / MA 312 / MA 457 / MA 459 student work sampled at level 2 or higher on the AAC&U Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 90% of work sampled in MA 303 and MA 459 was at level 2 or higher. 24 items at level 3; 14 items at level 2; 4 items at level 1. Multiple items assessed for each student in the class. 8 students (4 students in MA 303 and 4 students in MA 459) | Target met. Continue quality instruction. |
| | 3.1 (PO 2.c.) | The program will participate in outreach events for K-12 students. | Review the Events Log and count the number of outreach events the Mathematics faculty hosts. | Host at least two outreach events during the academic year. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Sonya Kovalevsky High School Mathematics Day, October 2016 Mississippi Regional Science Bowl, February 2017 | Target met. Faculty plan to continue with both these events in 2017-2018. |
| | 3.2 (PO 2.c.) | Mathematics majors will participate in community outreach and service opportunities. | Departmental faculty will review and analyze the results of the Departmental Exit Survey, which is provided to all graduating majors in the department. | 100% of graduates surveyed will indicate on the Departmental Exit Survey that they have participated in some community outreach and/or service opportunities while at MUW. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100% of graduates returning surveys indicated participation in community outreach and/or community service while at MUW. | Target met. Faculty will continue to encourage student involvement in the community and be role models for participating in community service. |
| Program - Music (including Music Education and Music Therapy) - BA, BM {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SAO) | Students will perform works from multiple musical periods on their major instrument at the end of their sophomore year. | Students will complete a 10 question Sophomore Exit Interview following the "Sophomore Barrier Jury," to determine their current progress and future career plans. | 80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating (given by the music faculty) during their Sophomore Exit Interview. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The students were given an exit interview following their "Sophomore Barrier Jury." All students gave solid answers to the questions posed, and also embraced some of the music faculty's suggestions on how to further grow their musical and academic careers. The music | The music faculty will continue to administer this interview at the conclusion of the "Sophomore Barrier Jury". We will also follow up with this year's students, to see whether they have implemented the music faculty's recommendation for self-improvement. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| Program - Music (including Music Education and Music Therapy) - BA, BM {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SAO) | Students will perform works from multiple musical periods on their major instrument at the end of their sophomore year. | Students will complete a 10 question Sophomore Exit Interview following the "Sophomore Barrier Jury," to determine their current progress and future career plans. | 80% of the students will receive at least a satisfactory rating (given by the music faculty) during their Sophomore Exit Interview. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | faculty concluded that all students met the "satisfactory" ranking at the conclusion of their exit interviews. | The music faculty will continue to administer this interview at the conclusion of the "Sophomore Barrier Jury". We will also follow up with this year's students, to see whether they have implemented the music faculty's recommendation for self-improvement. |
| | | | At the end of MUS 222, students will perform a 20 minute recital for all music faculty featuring works of at least 3 (Three) musical periods ("Sophomore Barrier Jury"). The performance must be technically/rhythmically secure, memorized, and stylistically appropriate. The entire music faculty, using the "Sophomore Barrier Rubric", will evaluate the student's performance. | 90% of the students will score at least an 80 (on the 1-100 scale used in the "Sophomore Barrier Rubric). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There were 12 music majors who have completed the "Sophomore Barrier Jury." They were assessed by the entire music faculty. Each faculty member graded the students' performances. After averaging the scores, we have concluded that 11 out of 12 students have scored 80% or better on their "Sophomore Barrier Jury" | The music faculty will continue to administer the "Sophomore Barrier Jury" to students enrolled in MUS 222. We will maintain the same goals to see if we encounter similar results in the future academic years. |
| | 1.2 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will complete written assignments on music history topics. | During MUS 302 (Music History 2) students will complete assignments to be graded using the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric. The MUS 302 instructor will assess their | The average scores for students on relevant assignments in MUS 302 will be 2 or higher on the 0-4 scale for the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | MUS 302 students were asked to write a research paper on the Catholic Mass. The discussed topics included Mass definition, order of movements, movement names, and the types of mass employed in | We will add more written assignments to the MUS 302 course to determine if this score can be maintained when a larger number of writing samples are present. . |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 1.2 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will complete written assignments on music history topics. | work. | The average scores for students on relevant assignments in MUS 302 will be 2 or higher on the 0-4 scale for the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | liturgical music. All six students completed the assignment. Two of them received a score of 4 on the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric, two students received a score of 3, while the others received a score of 2. The average score for students on this assignment was 2 or higher on the 0-4 scale for the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric. | We will add more written assignments to the MUS 302 course to determine if this score can be maintained when a larger number of writing samples are present. . |
| | 2.1 (PO 3.a.) | Students will compose musical works using music notation software (Sibelius or Finale). | Students in MUS 102 (Music Theory 2) will compose a musical work (solo or chamber music) using a music notation software. The MUS 102 instructor will assess their work using the "MUS 102 Final Project Rubric." | 90% of the students will score at least an 85 (on the 1-100 scale used in the "MUS 102 Final Project Rubric"). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There were 11 students registered for MUS 102 (Music Theory 2). They were asked to compose a 16 bar musical work using the techniques studied during the year. All the students have used the Sibelius notation software. A number of factors were used to assess their work (please see the MUS 102 Final Project Rubric for more info). Per each student, the points were totaled, then divided by 5 (the number of different assessment factors | We will continue to assign this type of project in the future years. We will compare the results of the future MUS 102 students with this year's. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 2.1 (PO 3.a.) | Students will compose musical works using music notation software (Sibelius or Finale). | Students in MUS 102 (Music Theory 2) will compose a musical work (solo or chamber music) using a music notation software. The MUS 102 instructor will assess their work using the "MUS 102 Final Project Rubric." | 90% of the students will score at least an 85 (on the 1-100 scale used in the "MUS 102 Final Project Rubric"). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | present in the rubric) in order to determine their final grade. All MUS 102 students completed this assignment, and all of them scored over 85 on this specific project. | We will continue to assign this type of project in the future years. We will compare the results of the future MUS 102 students with this year's. |
| | 2.2 (SLO) | Students will arrange a musical work of at least 4 measures using the common practice compositional techniques. | Students in MUS 102 (Music Theory 2) will write a four-part chorale in the style of J.S Bach work using the "figured bass" technique. The MUS 102 instructor will assess their work. | 80% of the students will score at least an 80% on this assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Students enrolled in MUS 102 were required to complete a "Take Home Exam" in which they were asked to compose a four-part chorale in the style of J.S Bach on a figured bass provided by the instructor. Within this chorale, students were required to use 9 non-harmonic tones, at least 4 instances of a diatonic 7th chord, and first and second inversions chords. There were 11 students registered for MUS 102 in the Spring of 2017, 10 completed the assignment and where graded on it, while one did not and received a grade of 0. Out of the 10 students graded, 1 received a | We will continue to assign these types of exercises throughout MUS 102. One change we have discussed is assigning and assessing multiple assignments involving chorales (both "take home" and "in-class" exercises). This would help us determine whether students are as successful when having to compose these works while being under a time constrain (a class period for example) as opposed to the current model where they do these type of exercises as part of their homework. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 2.2 (SLO) | Students will arrange a musical work of at least 4 measures using the common practice compositional techniques. | Students in MUS 102 (Music Theory 2) will write a four-part chorale in the style of J.S Bach work using the "figured bass" technique. The MUS 102 instructor will assess their work. | 80% of the students will score at least an 80% on this assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | grade of 100%, 1 a grade of 95%, 2 received 94%, 1 received 93%, 2 received 90%, 2 received 85%, and 1 received 77%. We can draw the conclusion that the goal was met. In order to meet this goal, 8.8 students should have scored 80% or higher on this assignment (since there were 11 students registered for the course, 10% = 1.1, thus 80% = 8.8). Even though one student received the grade of 0 while a second one received a grade below the 80% threshold, 9 out of 11 students have scored at least 80% on this assignment. | We will continue to assign these types of exercises throughout MUS 102. One change we have discussed is assigning and assessing multiple assignments involving chorales (both "take home" and "in-class" exercises). This would help us determine whether students are as successful when having to compose these works while being under a time constrain (a class period for example) as opposed to the current model where they do these type of exercises as part of their homework. |
| | 2.3 (SLO) | Students will create a transcription of a musical example containing a single line melody and complex rhythms. | Students in MUS 104 (Music Theory Lab 4) will transcribe a melody featuring ascending and descending intervals and complex rhythms, after hearing it 5 times. The MUS 104 instructor will assess their work. | 80% of the students will score at least an 80% on this assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | There were 10 students enrolled in the MUS 104 course for the Spring of 2017. As part of their final exam, they were asked to transcribe a 4 bar melody played on the piano after hearing it 5 times. The rubric titled "Guide To Grading Melodic Exercises" was used to assess | We will continue to assign melodic dictation exercises to our MUS 104 students. We will assign more melodic dictation homework during the 2017-2018 academic year, to ensure that students are able to practice this skill on a daily basis (either listen to a melody via a recording, or work with a partner who can play it on a musical instrument). We will review the results at the end of our next year, and determine whether this increased emphasis on melodic dictation helped improve the |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|-------------------|
| | 2.3 (SLO) | Students will create a transcription of a musical example containing a single line melody and complex rhythms. | Students in MUS 104 (Music Theory Lab 4) will transcribe a melody featuring ascending and descending intervals and complex rhythms, after hearing it 5 times. The MUS 104 instructor will assess their work. | 80% of the students will score at least an 80% on this assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | <p>students' performance.</p> <p>The assignment had a maximum point value of 35 points. According to our achievement target, 8 out of 10 students should have received 28 points or better for this assignment. Three (3) students received a score of 35 (maximum score), one (1) student received a score of 33, one (1) received a score of 30, one (1) received a score of 29. The remainder four students scored below 28, with two (2) missing the threshold by 2 points, while the others scoring very low. In conclusion, only 60% of the MUS 104 students have scored 80% or better. While the target result was only partially met, it is worth noting that the two students who scored close to the 28 point threshold where the difference between our targets being fully vs. partially met.</p> | students' scores. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| Program - Philosophy (including Applied and Professional Ethics Certificate) - Minor {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.b.) | The student will be able to critically analyze the arguments and viewpoints of him or herself and others. | In all philosophy courses (PHL 201-450), students will be given an argument identification and/or argument evaluation assignment (paper, in-class quiz, exam, oral exam) that will be graded using the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric. This assignment will be graded by the instructor of the course. | The average score of philosophy minors will be a '3' on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric on the argument identification and/or argument evaluation assignment in any philosophy course. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | For all students who minor in philosophy, an exam or writing assignment with an argument identification or evaluation component was selected for assessment using the AAC&U Critical Thinking Rubric. During the 2016-2017 academic year, there were three philosophy minors who took philosophy courses. Fall 2016: PHL 202 (one student); Spring 2017: PHL 450 (two students). The average score on the argument identification/evaluation assignment by philosophy minors was a 3.3. | In terms of maintaining the desired average score of 3.0 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking rubric, continue to (a) include a component on Argument Identification/Evaluation in every philosophy course, and (b) give an assignment that requires the completion of an argument identification or evaluation exercise. In terms of the performance of philosophy minors: maintain standards of performance with current minors and recruit new minors to build a greater pool. |
| | | | In all philosophy courses (PHL 201-450), students will be given an argument identification and/or argument evaluation assignment (paper, in-class quiz, exam, oral exam) that will be graded using the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric. This assignment will be graded by the instructor of the | The average score of students in a philosophy course will be a '3' on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric on the argument identification and/or argument evaluation assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | For all philosophy courses, an exam or writing assignment with an argument identification or evaluation component was selected for assessment using the AAC&U Critical Thinking Rubric. Five exams or written assignments were randomly selected from the student pool in every course section. A total of | Philosophy course instructors will (a) want to continue to offer a component on argument identification and/or evaluation in all sections of philosophy courses, and will (b) want to evaluate student ability to identify and/or evaluate arguments using at least one course assignment. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|--|--|------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | | | course. | The average score of students in a philosophy course will be a '3' on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric on the argument identification and/or argument evaluation assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100 assignments from 20 sections of philosophy and across all course levels (200- to 400-level) were assessed using the AAC&U Critical Thinking Rubric. Out of the 20 sections of philosophy, only six course sections scored below a 3.0. The average score across all 20 sections was a 3.15. | Philosophy course instructors will (a) want to continue to offer a component on argument identification and/or evaluation in all sections of philosophy courses, and will (b) want to evaluate student ability to identify and/or evaluate arguments using at least one course assignment. |
| | 1.2 (SLO) | The student of ethics will be able to solve an ethical dilemma using logical reasoning. | In all ethics courses (PHL 204, 206, 305, 306, 307, 465), students will be given an assignment that requires the evaluation of an ethical dilemma using the tools of logic and ethical reasoning. This assignment will be graded by the instructor using the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. | The average score of philosophy minors who take an ethics course will be a '3' on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric on the ethical dilemma assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | There were no philosophy minors who took ethics courses during the 2016-2017 academic year. | Philosophy instructors will continue to recruit philosophy minors to take the ethics courses as this is a required component of the minor in philosophy. |
| | | | In all ethics courses (PHL 204, 206, 305, 306, 307, 465), students will be given an assignment that requires the evaluation of an ethical dilemma using the tools of logic and ethical reasoning. This assignment will be | The average score of students in an ethics course will be a '3' on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric on the ethical dilemma assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | For all ethics courses offered during the 2016-2017 academic year, an exam or writing assignment with a component that involves the evaluation of an ethical dilemma using the tools of logic and ethical | The instructors of ethics courses will (a) want to continue to offer a component on the rational evaluation of an ethical dilemma using logical and moral reasoning in all sections of ethics courses, and will (b) want to evaluate student ability to evaluate and resolve ethical dilemmas using logical and/or moral reasoning using at least one course assignment. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | | graded by the instructor using the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. | The average score of students in an ethics course will be a '3' on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric on the ethical dilemma assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | reasoning was selected for assessment using the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. There were a total of four ethics courses assessed, including two section of PHL 204 Ethics and two sections of PHL 307 Medical Ethics. Five exams or written assignments were randomly selected from the student pool in every course section. (Hence, a total of 20 assignments from 4 sections of ethics were assessed). Using the AAC&U Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, the average score across all four sections of ethics was a 3.18. | The instructors of ethics courses will (a) want to continue to offer a component on the rational evaluation of an ethical dilemma using logical and moral reasoning in all sections of ethics courses, and will (b) want to evaluate student ability to evaluate and resolve ethical dilemmas using logical and/or moral reasoning using at least one course assignment. |
| | 1.3 (SAO) | Due to the fact that critical thinking—and more specifically, the ability to analyze the views of oneself and others—is a general education requirement (see also 1.1. GEO outcome above), all MUW students will be expected to successfully complete a course in philosophy. | A sampling of lower-level courses in philosophy (201 through 205) will be examined. Sample will be selected by random choice via enrollment roster. Instructors of philosophy will examine the results of final grading in each course and determine how many students out | The average score of the philosophy minors in each course included in the sample will be 85% (grade of B) or higher to indicate the successful completion of the philosophy course. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There was only one philosophy minor in a lower-level philosophy course that could be evaluated. That student received a final grade of 86% (B) in PHL 202 Aesthetics (Fall 2016). | As the target was met, continue to monitor the progress of philosophy minors in lower-level sections of philosophy to encourage those students to succeed. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|---|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 1.3 (SAO) | Due to the fact that critical thinking—and more specifically, the ability to analyze the views of oneself and others—is a general education requirement (see also 1.1. GEO outcome above), all MUW students will be expected to successfully complete a course in philosophy. | of each class successfully completed the course and thus fulfilled the Gen Ed requirement (1.b) and how many students failed to complete the course. | The average score of the philosophy minors in each course included in the sample will be 85% (grade of B) or higher to indicate the successful completion of the philosophy course. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There was only one philosophy minor in a lower-level philosophy course that could be evaluated. That student received a final grade of 86% (B) in PHL 202 Aesthetics (Fall 2016). | As the target was met, continue to monitor the progress of philosophy minors in lower-level sections of philosophy to encourage those students to succeed. |
| | | | A sampling of lower-level courses in philosophy (201 through 205) will be examined. Sample will be selected by random choice via enrollment roster. Instructors of philosophy will examine the results of final grading in each course and determine how many students out of each class successfully completed the course and thus fulfilled the Gen Ed requirement (1.b) and how many students failed to complete the course. | The average score of the students in each course included in the sample will be 75% (grade of C) or higher to indicate the successful completion of the philosophy course. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | A representative sampling of lower-level courses in philosophy (eight total) were assessed. The average score of students in the course was 82% (B-) and well over 80% of the students in each section received a grade of 'C' or higher in the class. | As the target was met, instructors should continue to monitor student progress in each course, assess student needs should academic difficulties arise, and seek to address those needs so as to continue to contribute to student success in fulfilling the Gen Ed requirement in Critical Thinking. |
| | 1.4 (PO 4.d.) | In keeping with the Mississippi University for Women's strategic priority/goal of "providing academic programs to meet the needs of today's student | Data will be collected by the philosophy program coordinator on the number of philosophy minors | A steady increase in philosophy minors declared over the next three years, from 6 to 10. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Based on examination of course rosters for the 2016-2017 academic year, it has been determined that | Philosophy instructors will seek to identify students who display ability and interest in philosophy to send an invitation to take up the minor. This worked well in the past, though it has not been used recently. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|---|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 1.4 (PO 4.d.) | and workforce” (SPG 4.d.), the philosophy program will seek to increase enrollment in the philosophy minor in the conviction that the skills, knowledge, and values instilled in the student of philosophy are invaluable to the success of the student as a person, worker, and citizen beyond graduation (as regards success in the workplace, this conviction is borne out in an abundance of empirical data). | declared. | A steady increase in philosophy minors declared over the next three years, from 6 to 10. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | there are currently around 4 philosophy minors. | Philosophy instructors will seek to identify students who display ability and interest in philosophy to send an invitation to take up the minor. This worked well in the past, though it has not been used recently. |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | The student will exhibit knowledge of the basic themes and ideas specific to the domain of philosophy covered in a given course. | In all philosophy courses, students will be given an assignment (exam, paper, etc.) that requires that the student demonstrate basic knowledge of the subject matter that defines the area of philosophy treated in that course by that point in the course (e.g., a student of PHL 202 Aesthetics will demonstrate knowledge of Kant’s aesthetics). Sample will be selected by random choice via enrollment roster. | The average score of the philosophy minors in each course included in the sample will be 85% (grade of B) or higher on the basic subject matter assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | As there were only three philosophy minors who took courses during the 2016-2017 academic year, a pool of three final or last exams, one per student was evaluated. These exams assessed student understanding of the subject matter of the course. The average score was 93.3% on the sample of exams from the philosophy minors. | Instructors will continue to employ methods of instruction that encourage the growth of knowledge in the particular subject area covered by the course. |
| | | | In all philosophy courses, students will be given an assignment (exam, | The average score of the students in each course included in the sample will be 75% | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | A sample of student scores on final or last exams was compiled from all | Instructors will continue to employ methods of instruction that encourage the growth of knowledge in the particular subject |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | | | paper, etc.) that requires that the student demonstrate basic knowledge of the subject matter that defines the area of philosophy treated in that course by that point in the course (e.g., a student of PHL 202 Aesthetics will demonstrate knowledge of Kant's aesthetics). Sample will be selected by random choice via enrollment roster. | (grade of C) or higher on the basic subject matter assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | philosophy classes. These exams assessed student understanding of the subject matter of the course. The average score was 79% on the sample of exams. | area covered by the course. |
| Program - Physical Sciences (including Secondary Education Certification) - BS {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SAO) | Students will demonstrate knowledge of principles, theories, laws in the physical sciences as well as educational theory, expectations and practices as state licensing requirements dictate. | Prior to internship, students will take the Praxis® Subject Assessments test to assess content knowledge in the field of physical sciences and the corresponding Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test to assess educational theory and knowledge. Faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of the students evaluated in the program will pass the Praxis Subject Assessments Test in Chemistry: Content Knowledge with a score of 151 or above. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | One student was in the program. He passed his exam with very high marks and was awarded recognition by TES. He got his endorsements for Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and Physical Science. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | | | Prior to internship, students will take the Praxis® Subject Assessments test to assess content knowledge in the | 90% of the students evaluated in the program will pass the Praxis Subject Assessments Test in Physics: Content | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | One student was in the program. He passed his exam with very high marks and was awarded | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | | | field of physical sciences and the corresponding Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test to assess educational theory and knowledge. Faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | Knowledge with a score of 139 or above. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | recognition by TES. He got his endorsements for Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and Physical Science. | Will continue assessment measures. |
| | | | Prior to internship, students will take the Praxis® Subject Assessments test to assess content knowledge in the field of physical sciences and the corresponding Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test to assess educational theory and knowledge. Faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of the students evaluated in the program will pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) Test with a score of 157 or above. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | One student was in the program. He passed his exam with very high marks and was awarded recognition by TES. He got his endorsements for Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and Physical Science. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | 1.2 (SLO) | In PS 313, students will successfully apply different pedagogical methods in the teaching of science. | In PS 313, students will develop a detailed Science Unit Plan. Faculty will review and analyze the Science Unit Plan using the Science Unit Plan Scoring Rubric. | 90% of PS 313 students evaluated in the program will score at least an “80” on the 0-114 scale used in the Science Unit Plan Scoring Rubric (placed in documents folder) in developing a Science Unit Plan. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled student scored above an 80 on the Science Unit Plan Scoring Rubric meeting target. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.b.) | Students will successfully | In PS 313, faculty | PS 313 students | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled | For the following year, there are no |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.b.) | analyze and test standard experimental methods and suggest improvements. | will use the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric to assess the student's evaluation of an existing experimental procedure. | evaluated in the program will average a score of at least a "3" on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric in evaluating an existing experimental procedure. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | student scored above a 3 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric meeting target. | enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | 2.2 (GEO 1.b.) | Students will successfully select techniques, apparatus and materials in the designing of experiments. | In BSB 304, faculty will use the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric to assess the student's design of an experimental procedure. | PS 313 students will average a score of at least a "3" on the 0 - 4 scale used in the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric in designing an experimental procedure in BSB 304 Research Methods. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled student scored above a 3 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric meeting target. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | 3.1 (SLO) | Students will successfully research safety aspects and first aid protocol in a chemistry lab. | In PS 313, faculty will use the Safety and Welfare Module Scoring Rubric to assess student's Safety and Emergency Lesson Plan and Safety Policies and Procedures. | 90% of PS 313 students evaluated in the program will develop a Safety and Emergency Lesson Plan and score at least a "8" on the 0 - 12 scale used in the Safety and Welfare Module Scoring Rubric (placed in documents folder) in developing 1. Hazardous Inventory List, 2. Storage Floor Plan for Chemical Storage, 3. Discussion of Safe and Proper Techniques for Preparation, Storage, Dispensing, Supervision, and Disposal of Inventory Items, 4. Discussion of Safety Policies and Procedures as Established by State | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled student scored above an 8 on the Safety and Welfare Module Scoring Rubric meeting target. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 3.1 (SLO) | Students will successfully research safety aspects and first aid protocol in a chemistry lab. | In PS 313, faculty will use the Safety and Welfare Module Scoring Rubric to assess student's Safety and Emergency Lesson Plan and Safety Policies and Procedures. | and/or National Guidelines, and 5. Learning Activities that Demonstrate Maintenance of Safety Equipment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled student scored above an 8 on the Safety and Welfare Module Scoring Rubric meeting target. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | 4.1 (GEO 1.b.) | Students will demonstrate various management techniques for the classroom. | In PS 313, faculty will use the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric to assess the students' evaluation of a webinar on classroom management. | PS 313 students evaluated in the program will evaluate a webinar in relevance to classroom management and average a score of at least a "3" on the 0 – 4 used in the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric in an evaluation of the webinar. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled student scored above an 3 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric meeting target. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | 5.1 (PO 2.e.) | Students will actively engage in local K – 12 school events that provide real-life experiences for students. | In PS 313, faculty will use the Professional Development Module Scoring Rubric to assess the student's participation in local K – 12 school events that provides real-life experiences for students. | 100% of the PS 313 students evaluated in the program will do K-12 outreach and score at least a "2" on the 0 – 3 Professional Development Module Scoring Rubric (placed in documents folder). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled student scored above an 2 on the Professional Development Module Scoring Rubric meeting target. He participated in a family science fair at New Hope Middle School. He judged a science fair contest at the local middle school. He attended the National Association of Science Teachers Conference in Nashville last year. | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| | 5.2 (PO 2.c.) | Students will participate in university or | Students will complete an Exit | 100% of the PS 313 students participating | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The one enrolled student scored | For the following year, there are no enrolled students as of right now, |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|---------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 5.2 (PO 2.c.) | community activities that strengthen and expand K-12 partnership. | Survey during the semester before their professional teaching internship. On the Exit Survey, students will answer questions concerning their participation in K-12 outreach activities. Faculty will review and analyze the results determine if achievement target was met. | in the Exit Survey will report that they participated in at least one outreach activity. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | above an 2 on the Professional Development Module Scoring Rubric meeting target. He participated in a family science fair at New Hope Middle School. He judged a science fair contest at the local middle school. | but PS 313 will be taught in the Spring of 2018 and a practice Praxis exam will be issued as a precursor to their standardized Praxis exams. Will continue assessment measures. |
| Program - Physical Theatre (including Certificate) - MFA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | First year students will increase level of technical performance skills (acting, voice, movement, and music). | Movement/ Voice (TH 501) introduces students to graduate level voice/speech skills and specific movement vocabulary, leading to specific improvisatory and composition skills. A rubric is used to measure specific technical proficiency. Monologues, Scene Work and dramaturgical exercises in the acting sequence (TH 551 and TH 552) offer students a wide variety of textual and Physical Theatre challenges to home skills. Both the texts and the physical oriented theatre span a number of eras and | 75% of students are expected to perform at Journeyman level on the departmental rubric by the end of year one. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100% of the students in the first year of the program met this goal. | no change in strategy necessary at this time |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| Program - Physical Theatre (including Certificate) - MFA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | First year students will increase level of technical performance skills (acting, voice, movement, and music). | genres offering different stylistic material. Assessment forms are completed for each performance and expectations become more rigorous with each advanced course. | 75% of students are expected to perform at Journeyman level on the departmental rubric by the end of year one. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100% of the students in the first year of the program met this goal. | no change in strategy necessary at this time |
| | 1.2 (SLO) | First year students will create and perform original dramatic works in the form of solo and ensemble projects with a balance in both form and content. | “Hands on” creation of projects is introduced and executed at the end of each semester of the first year of study in public performances. Skills are all evaluated on a rubric for technical and artistic merit. Performances are created and performed in TH 551, TH552, and TH 502 with public showings at the end of each semester. Additional performances are given in Modules 3 (FLIC Circus School in Torino). | 75% of students should show proficiency at the Journeyman level on the departmental rubric by end of the first year. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 100% of the students in the first year met this goal. | no change in strategy necessary at this time |
| | 1.3 (SLO) | First year students will increase/develop a strong work ethic. Students are expected to perform assigned tasks with diligence, reliability, and punctuality. | Attendance is strictly monitored in all departmental courses. Students are evaluated by a rubric (based on Professional/Union standards) for each rehearsal. This rubric is used to determine grade in Performance Labs. | 80% of students will meet professional standard on the departmental rubric by end of first year. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 88% of the students in the first year met this goal. | The expectations of this goal were clarified for the students mid-term as questions arose .Faculty are committed to implementing a coherent and transparent policy regarding Demeanor and Code of Ethics through reinforced concentration and consistency among core faculty (some teachers were more lenient with policy which caused confusion of expectations.) |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 1.3 (SLO) | First year students will increase/develop a strong work ethic. Students are expected to perform assigned tasks with diligence, reliability, and punctuality. | Adherence to Rehearsal Demeanor and Code of Ethics is monitored through a log of required attendance for meetings, rehearsals, and performances. Students are further required to collaborate actively in research projects of their peers and are graded accordingly. | 80% of students will meet professional standard on the departmental rubric by end of first year. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 88% of the students in the first year met this goal. | The expectations of this goal were clarified for the students mid-term as questions arose .Faculty are committed to implementing a coherent and transparent policy regarding Demeanor and Code of Ethics through reinforced concentration and consistency among core faculty (some teachers were more lenient with policy which caused confusion of expectations.) |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Second year students will increase level of technical performance skills (acting, voice, movement, music). | Advanced Movement/ Voice (TH 601) continues the study of graduate level voice/speech skills and specific movement vocabulary, leading to specific improvisatory and composition skills. A rubric is used to measure specific technical proficiency. Monologues, Scene Work and dramaturgical exercises in all levels of the acting sequence (TH 634, TH 635, TH 636) offer students a wide variety of textual and Physical Theatre challenges to home skills. Both | 70% of students are expected to perform at Mastery level on the departmental rubric by the end of the second year of course work. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 65% of the students met this goal. | As the faculty reviews the definitions of "Mastery level performance" we realize that the expectations in the rubric were too high for a 2-year program. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Second year students will increase level of technical performance skills (acting, voice, movement, music). | the texts and the physical oriented theatre span a number of eras and genres offering different stylistic material. Assessment forms are completed for each performance and expectations become more rigorous with each advanced course. | 70% of students are expected to perform at Mastery level on the departmental rubric by the end of the second year of course work. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 65% of the students met this goal. | As the faculty reviews the definitions of "Mastery level performance" we realize that the expectations in the rubric were too high for a 2-year program. |
| | 2.2 (SLO) | Second year students will create and perform original dramatic works in the form of solo and ensemble projects with a balance in both form and content. | "Hands on" creation of projects is continued in the second year of study through public performances. Skills are all evaluated on a rubric for technical and artistic merit. Performances are created and performed in TH 635, and TH 693 with public showings at the end of each semester. Additional performances are given in Module 6 at Famille Floz, Berlin and in Module 7 at Continuo Theatre, Prague. | 70% of students should show proficiency at the Mastery level on the departmental rubric by end of the second year of course work. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 42% of the students met this goal as it is defined. It should be noted that the 40% who met this goal are not necessarily the same students who met Goal 2.1. | As the faculty reviews its definition of "Mastery level" performance we realize that the expectations were inflated and barely reachable in a 2-year program. We intend to re-write the expectations without lowering standards, but perhaps being more realistic. |
| | 2.3 (SLO) | Second year students will increase/develop a Strong Work Ethic. Students are expected to perform assigned tasks with diligence, reliability, and punctuality. | Attendance is strictly monitored in all departmental courses. Students are evaluated by a rubric (based on Professional/Union standards) for each rehearsal. This | 85% of students will meet professional standard on the departmental rubric by end of the second year of course work. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 85% of the students met this goal. | no change in strategy necessary |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | 2.3 (SLO) | Second year students will increase/develop a Strong Work Ethic. Students are expected to perform assigned tasks with diligence, reliability, and punctuality. | rubric is used to determine grade in Performance Labs. Adherence to Rehearsal Demeanor and Code of Ethics is monitored through a log of required attendance for meetings, rehearsals, and performances. Students are further required to collaborate actively in research projects of their peers and are graded accordingly. | 85% of students will meet professional standard on the departmental rubric by end of the second year of course work. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 85% of the students met this goal. | no change in strategy necessary |
| | 2.4 (SLO) | Second year students will demonstrate Contextualize Practice, the ability to situate current practice in a historical and cultural framework. | Students are introduced to the idea of analyzing, evaluating and critiquing both historically pertinent theatre and contemporary performance. Critical essays, dramaturgical analysis and peer critiques are evaluated for content, execution, and presentation. Students in all of these classes are guided through goal setting exercises (for self) which are compared at the beginning and the end of each semester. Journals | 60% of students enrolled in degree program will be conversant and articulate at the Mastery Level on the departmental rubric at end of Year Two. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 64% of the students met this goal. | no changes necessary |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|---|--|--|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | 2.4 (SLO) | Second year students will demonstrate Contextualize Practice, the ability to situate current practice in a historical and cultural framework. | are kept for self-evaluation. | 60% of students enrolled in degree program will be conversant and articulate at the Mastery Level on the departmental rubric at end of Year Two. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 64% of the students met this goal. | no changes necessary |
| | 3.1 (SAO & RO) | Students will complete MFA Degree with a written thesis. | Departmental faculty will review student records to determine if achievement target was met. | 75% of students who complete the two years of coursework will submit a completed thesis within 5 years of entering the program (2.5 years after final coursework). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 87% of the students who have enrolled in thesis course and have had the full 5 years to complete the thesis have completed . | This Goal is "ongoing" as it is defined to measure the completion rate of the degree. Since we give students 5 years to after last course to complete thesis, we are only measuring those Cohorts which finished 5 years ago or more. (Cohorts I and II). |
| | 4.1 (PO 3.c.) | Students will increase appreciation and understanding of theatre in a global context. | Students graduating the program will be given an Exit Survey and departmental faculty will review and analyze the survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of Graduates participating in the Exit Survey will indicate the experience of international studies as a unique and valuable educational experience beyond the traditional on-campus experience. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The execution of the formal survey has been inconsistent, therefore I am not submitting a result. Informally, I can attest to conversations that would support 90% or higher rate of students who would indicated the expressed outcome state in the Target. | I need to formalize the survey and send it to as many graduates as possible and report figures next year (or update this reporting period when results are established if that is allowed.) |
| Program - Political Science (including Minor and Public Administration Certificate) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.b.) | Interpret and evaluate sources and/or evidence carefully and use them to make an argument. | The Political Science faculty will use the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric to assess the analytical assignment required in an upper-level POL course (fall). | The overall average score for students in an upper-level POL course completing the analytical assignment will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Evidence for both the Critical Thinking and Written Communication Rubrics is drawn from 7 student "Historical Policy Analysis" essay submissions in POL 410 The American Presidency in Fall 2016 (see below for assignment details). The average score | Moving forward, the POL faculty teaching the class will include more detailed requirements in the assignment description for selecting multiple sources that speak to the same topic from different perspectives, and upper-level courses will have more class discussions built around competing expert arguments. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| Program - Political Science (including Minor and Public Administration Certificate) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.b.) | Interpret and evaluate sources and/or evidence carefully and use them to make an argument. | The Political Science faculty will use the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric to assess the analytical assignment required in an upper-level POL course (fall). | The overall average score for students in an upper-level POL course completing the analytical assignment will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | <p>across categories for this rubric was 3.1, so our target was met. The average student score was highest for the “explanation of issues” value and lowest on the “evidence” dimension. In fact, students’ critical engagement with sources was below the level three target.</p> <p>The assignment details included: Historical Policy Analysis This is a 5-7 page essay in which you identify and investigate a US President’s attempt to change public policy, assess their success influencing the policy, and present an explanation for their relative success or failure. Your explanation should seek support from historical comparisons with past Presidential successes or failures (this is where your fact sheet, and those of your classmates, should become helpful) and from one or more</p> | Moving forward, the POL faculty teaching the class will include more detailed requirements in the assignment description for selecting multiple sources that speak to the same topic from different perspectives, and upper-level courses will have more class discussions built around competing expert arguments. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|----------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| Program - Political Science (including Minor and Public Administration Certificate) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.b.) | Interpret and evaluate sources and/or evidence carefully and use them to make an argument. | The Political Science faculty will use the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric to assess the analytical assignment required in an upper-level POL course (fall). | The overall average score for students in an upper-level POL course completing the analytical assignment will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | theories presented in our readings. If we have not covered a theory that supports your explanation, you will need to explain why a theory we covered is not relevant to your case or is contradicted by your case. Roughly, you can be guided by the following scheme: 0.5-1 page introduction, 1.5-2 pages identifying & summarizing policy goals and efforts, 2-3 pages describing your explanation of influence and support for that explanation (theory & history), 1 page concluding. | Moving forward, the POL faculty teaching the class will include more detailed requirements in the assignment description for selecting multiple sources that speak to the same topic from different perspectives, and upper-level courses will have more class discussions built around competing expert arguments. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate effective context and purpose for writing, content development, genre and disciplinary conventions, source and evidence use, and control of syntax and mechanics. | The Political Science faculty will use the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the analytical writing assignment required of students in an upper-level POL class (fall). | The overall average score for students in an upper-level POL class completing the analytical writing assignment will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Evidence for both the Written Communication Rubrics is drawn from 7 student "Historical Policy Analysis" essay submissions in POL 410 The American Presidency (see below for assignment description). The average score across categories for this rubric was 3.3, so our target was met. | To ensure that we meet the benchmark next year, the POL faculty will place more emphasis on the organizational structure of academic articles assigned for class readings, projecting them for the class to look through during discussion. This will increase student awareness, and revised assignment requirements will ensure students know they are expected to adopt these methods of presentation. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate effective context and purpose for writing, content development, genre and disciplinary conventions, source and evidence use, and control of syntax and mechanics. | The Political Science faculty will use the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the analytical writing assignment required of students in an upper-level POL class (fall). | The overall average score for students in an upper-level POL class completing the analytical writing assignment will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | <p>The average student score was highest for the “sources and evidence” value, which leads us to expect improvement in the “evidence” component of critical thinking will be achievable. Students are already seeking out high-quality sources; they simply need to be encouraged to question the experts. The students scored lowest on the “genre and disciplinary conventions” dimension of written communication. The average student score was exactly 3.</p> <p>Historical Policy Analysis This is a 5-7 page essay in which you identify and investigate a US President’s attempt to change public policy, assess their success influencing the policy, and present an explanation for their relative success or failure. Your explanation should seek support from</p> | To ensure that we meet the benchmark next year, the POL faculty will place more emphasis on the organizational structure of academic articles assigned for class readings, projecting them for the class to look through during discussion. This will increase student awareness, and revised assignment requirements will ensure students know they are expected to adopt these methods of presentation. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|--|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | 2.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Students will demonstrate effective context and purpose for writing, content development, genre and disciplinary conventions, source and evidence use, and control of syntax and mechanics. | The Political Science faculty will use the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric to assess the analytical writing assignment required of students in an upper-level POL class (fall). | The overall average score for students in an upper-level POL class completing the analytical writing assignment will be no lower than a 3.0 on the AAC&U Written Communication VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | historical comparisons with past Presidential successes or failures (this is where your fact sheet, and those of your classmates, should become helpful) and from one or more theories presented in our readings. If we have not covered a theory that supports your explanation, you will need to explain why a theory we covered is not relevant to your case or is contradicted by your case. Roughly, you can be guided by the following scheme: 0.5-1 page introduction, 1.5-2 pages identifying & summarizing policy goals and efforts, 2-3 pages describing your explanation of influence and support for that explanation (theory & history), 1 page concluding. | To ensure that we meet the benchmark next year, the POL faculty will place more emphasis on the organizational structure of academic articles assigned for class readings, projecting them for the class to look through during discussion. This will increase student awareness, and revised assignment requirements will ensure students know they are expected to adopt these methods of presentation. |
| | 3.1 (PO 2.e.) | Students will demonstrate understanding of how the curriculum in the major and in-class learning relate to problems of the real world. | The department chair or Political Science faculty will analyze the POL 490 students' results from the Internship Survey that asks the degree to which their coursework | The overall average for POL 490 students completing the Internship Survey will be that students report seeing an increase of at least "3.0" on a 1-5 Likert scale, regarding the | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | In AY 2016-7, two students completed POL 490. In spring 2017, the department chair sent all students who had completed POL 490 the survey via email regarding | The email to the students came too late in the academic year and needed to be done before students finished their internship or in the first week of having completed the internship. The department chair will work with POL faculty to make sure that POL 490 students complete the internship survey |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|-----------------|---|--|---|------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | 3.1 (PO 2.e.) | Students will demonstrate understanding of how the curriculum in the major and in-class learning relate to problems of the real world. | relates to and prepares them to handle real-world problems (fall). | degree to which their coursework relates to and prepares them to handle real-world problems. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | their internship. None of the students responded to the email or the attached survey. As a result, no data was collected from students. | before they get a grade for the internship. This will ensure that we collect data to assess the program. |
| | 4.1 (SAO & SLO) | Students will demonstrate that they possess a basic understanding of how to analyze and interpret discipline specific research and use it effectively as evidence. | At the end of the spring semester, the Political Science faculty will review the final grade of students enrolled in POL 350 (the methods class for POL majors) and determine if the achievement target was met. | The overall average of POL 350 students for the class will be no lower than a C+ (77 percent). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In spring 2017, the POL 350 class had three students enrolled. At the end of the semester, the faculty instructor reported that the average class grade was a B- or 82%. | We changed the title of POL 350 in the 2016-7 academic year and the new title for the class is POL 203 Social and Political Analysis. The course will continue to serve as a methods course and the evaluation will be the same. |
| Program - Religious Studies - Minor {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 2.c.) | Religious studies minors will demonstrate the ability to use religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of a particular world religion. | In any religious studies course involving direct analysis of a particular religion, the student's Exam will be evaluated with the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. The faculty member for the class and the lead faculty member in religious studies will assess the student's work. | The average score of students will be at least a 3 on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric in using religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of a particular world religion on the Exam. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Four (4) Religious Studies minors in REL 308 Western Women's Roles in Religion (Spring 2017) scored an average of 3 (3.3) on the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric when using religious studies methods and concepts to analyze the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of a particular world religion (Judaism or Christianity) on the Mid-Term Exam. (One student scored 4, two students | Target met. Continue actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|----------------|---|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Program - Religious Studies - Minor {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 2.c.) | Religious studies minors will demonstrate the ability to use religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of a particular world religion. | In any religious studies course involving direct analysis of a particular religion, the student's Exam will be evaluated with the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. The faculty member for the class and the lead faculty member in religious studies will assess the student's work. | The average score of students will be at least a 3 on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric in using religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of a particular world religion on the Exam. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | scored 3 or above, and one student scored above 2.) | Target met. Continue actions. |
| | | | In any religious studies course involving direct analysis of a particular religion, the student's Mid-Term Essay will be evaluated with the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. The faculty member for the class and the lead faculty member in religious studies will assess the student's work. | The average score of students will be at least a 3 on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric in using religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of a particular world religion on the Mid-Term Essay. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Four (4) Religious Studies minors in REL 308 Western Women's Roles in Religion (Spring 2017) scored an average of 3 (2.92) on the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric when using religious studies methods and concepts to analyze the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of a particular world religion (Judaism) on the Mid-Term Essay. (Three students scored 3 or above and one student scored above 1.) | Target met. Continue actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | 1.2 (GEO 2.b.) | Religious studies minors will demonstrate the ability to use religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing and comparing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of at least two world religions. | In any religious studies course involving direct analysis of at least two world religions, the student's Exam will be evaluated with the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. The faculty member for the class and the lead faculty member in religious studies will assess the student's work. | The average score of students will be at least a 3 on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric in using religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing and comparing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of at least two world religions on the Exam. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Four (4) Religious Studies minors in REL 308 Western Women's Roles in Religion (Spring 2017) scored an average of 3 (3.08) on the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric when using religious studies methods and concepts to analyze and compare the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of at least two world religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) on their final exam. (Three students scored 3 or above and one student scored above 1.) | Target met. Continue actions. |
| | | | In any religious studies course involving direct analysis of at least two world religions, the student's Mid-Term Essay will be evaluated with the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. The faculty member for the class and the lead faculty member in religious studies will | The average score of students will be at least a 3 on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric in using religious studies methods and concepts in analyzing and comparing the history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of at least two world religions on | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Four (4) Religious Studies minors in REL 308 Western Women's Roles in Religion (Spring 2017) scored an average of 3 (2.92) on the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric when using religious studies methods and concepts to analyze and compare the | Target met. Continue actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | assess the student's work. | the Mid-Term Essay. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | history, basic beliefs, and characteristic practices of at least two world religions (Judaism, Christianity, and new religious movements) on their Mid-Term Research Essay. (Three students scored 3 or above and one student scored above 2.) | Target met. Continue actions. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 2.a.) | Religious studies minors will demonstrate the ability to use religious studies methods and concepts to conduct in-depth analysis of one or more texts from a particular religious tradition. | In any religious studies course involving direct analysis of one or more texts from a particular world religion, the student's Exam will be evaluated with the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. The faculty member for the class and the lead faculty member in religious studies will assess the student's work. | The average score of students will be at least a 3 on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric in demonstrating the ability to use religious studies methods and concepts to conduct in-depth analysis of one or more texts from a particular religious tradition on the Exam. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | One (1) Religious Studies minor in REL 355 Bible as Literature (Fall 2016) scored 4 (3.7) on the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric when using religious studies methods and concepts to conduct in-depth analysis of a text from a particular world religion (Christianity) on the Final Exam. | Target met. Continue actions. |
| | | | In any religious studies course involving direct analysis of one or more texts from a particular world religion, the student's Mid-Term Essay will be evaluated with the | The average score of students will be at least a 3 on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric in demonstrating the ability to use religious | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | One (1) Religious Studies minor in REL 355 Bible as Literature (Fall 2016) scored 3 (3.3) on the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric when using | Target met. Continue actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------------|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. The faculty member for the class and the lead faculty member in religious studies will assess the student's work. | studies methods and concepts to conduct in-depth analysis of one or more texts from a particular religious tradition on the Mid-Term Essay. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | religious studies methods and concepts to conduct in-depth analysis of one or more texts from a particular religious tradition (Judaism) on the Mid-Term Essay. | Target met. Continue actions. |
| | 3.1 (SAO & PO 4.a.) | Religious studies minors will receive advising in the minor each semester to ensure the successful completion of the minor's requirements. | Each semester, the Lead Faculty will complete both the department's internal audit sheet for the minor and the audit sheet provided by the Registrar and will provide a copy of the internal audit sheet to the student. The Lead Faculty will also keep the completed audit sheets on file for review at the end of each academic year. | 100% of students will attend an advising session each semester with the Lead Faculty in Religious Studies and receive a copy of his/her internal audit sheet. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In fall 2016, the program had one minor. The Lead Faculty met with this student for advising, provided a completed internal audit sheet to the student, and kept a completed audit sheet on file. In spring 2017, two additional students declared the minor. The Lead Faculty met with these students and the already-enrolled student for advising, provided completed internal audit sheets to the students, and kept completed audit sheets on file (for a total of three students). In reviewing the completed audit sheets and student transcripts at the end of the academic year, the Lead Faculty concluded that the students are on track to | Target met. Continue actions. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------------|--|--|---|------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | 3.1 (SAO & PO 4.a.) | Religious studies minors will receive advising in the minor each semester to ensure the successful completion of the minor's requirements. | Each semester, the Lead Faculty will complete both the department's internal audit sheet for the minor and the audit sheet provided by the Registrar and will provide a copy of the internal audit sheet to the student. The Lead Faculty will also keep the completed audit sheets on file for review at the end of each academic year. | 100% of students will attend an advising session each semester with the Lead Faculty in Religious Studies and receive a copy of his/her internal audit sheet. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | complete the requirements for the minor by graduation. | Target met. Continue actions. |
| | | | The Lead Faculty will map out the student's remaining coursework at each advising session, will conduct a final advising session with the student once all requirements have been met, and will confirm that the student will graduate with the minor. At the end of the academic year, the Lead Faculty will review the students' documents/audit sheets. | 90% of students will attend a final audit confirming that all requirements of the minor have been met and will graduate with the minor. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | No Religious Studies minors graduated in 2016-2017, so no final advising sessions or final audits were completed. | Results inconclusive. Continue actions when a religious studies minor is completing the requirements and preparing to graduate. |
| | 4.1 (SLO) | Religious studies minors will report that they have gained a broad understanding of religion as a human phenomenon and they understand the | A written Exit Survey using a five-point scale on each of five questions will be given to the student in the final semester | 90% of students participating in the Exit Survey will report at least a 3 rating (satisfied) on a five-point scale that they | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | No religious studies minors graduated in 2016-2017, so the Exit Survey was not administered. | Results inconclusive. Continue actions when a religious studies minor has completed the requirements and is preparing to graduate. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|----------------|--|---|--|------------------|--------------|---|---|
| | 4.1 (SLO) | history and contemporary expressions of world religious traditions. | before completion. The Lead Faculty will review and analyze the Exit Survey results at the end of the academic year. | have gained a broad understanding of religion as a human phenomenon and they understand the history and contemporary expressions of world religious traditions. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | No religious studies minors graduated in 2016-2017, so the Exit Survey was not administered. | Results inconclusive. Continue actions when a religious studies minor has completed the requirements and is preparing to graduate. |
| Program - Spanish (including Minor and K-12 Certification) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.c.) | Knowledge of Grammar: Students will be able to manipulate simple structures. Students will know the basic verbal system of Spanish (tenses, moods, aspects) and be able to produce forms. | Students will produce a written assignment (composition or exam) that will be graded by the instructor using the AAC&U Writing Communication Value Rubric. | The average score of students on the written assignment will be a 2 or higher on the scale 0-4 from the AAC&U Writing Communication Value Rubric on the control of syntax and mechanics evaluation of this assignment. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | target met; all 22 compositions scored a 2 or higher on the syntax and mechanics evaluations of the composition | Beginning in 2018, include in assessment of Spanish IV compositions the Context and Purpose of Writing, Genre and Disciplinary Conventions and Control of Syntax and Mechanics. The average score will continue to be 2 or higher on the scale 0-4 from the AAC&U Writing Communication Value Rubric. |
| | 1.2 (GEO 1.c.) | Speaking Proficiency: Students will be able to go beyond the one word response and be able to produce simple, sentence-length utterances with a reasonably accurate pronunciation on topics related to their personal and academic lives (family, classes, daily activities, leisure activities, etc.) | Students will complete an oral exam with the instructor that will be evaluated using the AAC&U Oral Communication Rubric. | The average score of students on the oral assignment will be a 2 or higher on the scale of 0-4 from the use of Language as described by AAC&U Oral Communication Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Target met; students interacted with instructor in 3 different situations and used appropriate pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary for level. Average score based on VALUE rubric: 3.1 | Continue to use same rubric and milestone. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 2.c.) | Cultural Knowledge: Students will explore issues related to Hispanic cultures at a basic level. Students will have an awareness of cultural differences and be able to make comparisons between Hispanic cultures and their own. | Students will complete an assignment on a topic of cultural relevance that relates to the Spanish-speaking world. This will be graded by the instructor using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and | The average score of students on the cultural relevance assignment will be a 3 or higher on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Students prepared compositions about studying abroad in Madrid, referencing specific sites of cultural and historic interest, drawing comparisons between US and Spain, and discussing holidays and celebrations or | Continue with plan. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------------|---|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | 2.1 (GEO 2.c.) | Cultural Knowledge: Students will explore issues related to Hispanic cultures at a basic level. Students will have an awareness of cultural differences and be able to make comparisons between Hispanic cultures and their own. | Competence VALUE Rubric. | The average score of students on the cultural relevance assignment will be a 3 or higher on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | traditions specific to the Spain. At the lower levels, they presented on differences and similarities between US and SS world relating to cultural topics. Average score: 3.05 | Continue with plan. |
| | 2.2 (SAO & GEO 2.c.) | Students will articulate their cumulative cultural knowledge in a Capstone assignment by examining cultural differences and making comparisons. | Students will complete the Cultural Differences Capstone Assignment that requires them to demonstrate an awareness of cultural differences among Spanish speakers. This assignment will be graded by the instructor using the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. | The average score of students on the Cultural Differences Capstone Assignment will be a 3 or higher on the 0-4 scale used in the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Several students struggled to identify own cultural biases and to move beyond surface questions about Spanish speakers in the US. Language skills and major errors in oral expression made it difficult to determine the extent to which students were able to identify the specific needs of Spanish-speaking population in the US and the importance of bilingual speakers, generally. Average VALUE score: 2.7 | Rework capstone assignment so that students prepare a written composition and an oral presentation to class on topic of cultural interest and relevance to SS world. The written assignment should facilitate comprehension (for audience and student presenter). |
| | 2.3 (PO 3.b.) | The completion of four semesters of Spanish will encourage global thinking and perspectives through broadening of cultural and language-based knowledge among our students. In an effort to provide students with a “global perspective” and to prepare “them for the global workforce of | The assessment coordinator will collect data from an Enrollment Report on the number of declared Spanish minors and majors at the end of the academic year. | An increase in minors and majors over the next three years (7 and 3, respectively). | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | Declared Spanish majors: 3 Declared Spanish minors: 3 | Continue recruitment efforts, including promoting study abroad for the major and minor and extracurricular activities (film and clubs) |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | 2.3 (PO 3.b.) | the future,” the Spanish program will actively seek to increase interest and enrollment in the Spanish minor and major. | The assessment coordinator will collect data from an Enrollment Report on the number of declared Spanish minors and majors at the end of the academic year. | An increase in minors and majors over the next three years (7 and 3, respectively). | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | Declared Spanish majors: 3 Declared Spanish minors: 3 | Continue recruitment efforts, including promoting study abroad for the major and minor and extracurricular activities (film and clubs) |
| Program - Theatre - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will increase their level of communication skills. | All first-year transfer students will be reviewed at the end of the Fall semester (last week of regular classes). They are given a four question Survey in advance that allows them to self-assess their own growth as theatre artists (see attached doc, “Questions for Sophomore Review.” The interviewees will be required to turn in written answers to reviewing faculty, but will be required to give an oral response as well. This method of assessment will allow the students to see what skills they need to focus on in the latter part of their college careers. The questions will be scored using the department’s own “SOPHOMORE/TRANSFER | 60% of transfers participating in the Survey are expected to score on the Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition Project Rubric a “strong pass” in two of the three following categories: performance/presentation; craftsmanship; and interpretation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 2 out of 6 (33%) first year transfers met the requirement. | We will use this benchmark for one more year. However, the data does not support the observed accomplishment of those students assessed. It may be that our requirements are unrealistically high. This will be analyzed after next year’s assessment |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---|---|---|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Program - Theatre - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will increase their level of communication skills. | INTERVIEW/AUDITION PROJECT” Rubric. Originally, assessment was rotated with graduating Seniors being reported in odd-numbered years and sophomore review taking place in even-numbered years. Until the number of students is sufficient to support this protocol, both methods of assessment will be used every year. Sophomore and first year transfer review will take place at the end of the Fall semester and Senior exit portfolios will take place in the last two weeks of the Spring semester. The Department intends to assign a date for the “exit portfolio review.” On that date graduating seniors will present an “acting portfolio” and/or a “technical theatre portfolio” to the faculty. The Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition Project Rubric will be use to assess the level of expertise in the student’s chosen | 60% of transfers participating in the Survey are expected to score on the Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition Project Rubric a “strong pass” in two of the three following categories: performance/presentation; craftsmanship; and interpretation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 2 out of 6 (33%) first year transfers met the requirement. | We will use this benchmark for one more year. However, the data does not support the observed accomplishment of those students assessed. It may be that our requirements are unrealistically high. This will be analyzed after next year's assessment |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Program - Theatre - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (SLO) | Students will increase their level of communication skills. | area of presentation. | 60% of transfers participating in the Survey are expected to score on the Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition Project Rubric a "strong pass" in two of the three following categories: performance/presentation; craftsmanship; and interpretation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 2 out of 6 (33%) first year transfers met the requirement. | We will use this benchmark for one more year. However, the data does not support the observed accomplishment of those students assessed. It may be that our requirements are unrealistically high. This will be analyzed after next year's assessment |
| | | | All sophomore students will be reviewed at the end of the Fall semester (last week of regular classes). They are given a four question Survey in advance that allows them to self-assess their own growth as theatre artists (see attached doc, "Questions for Sophomore Review." The interviewees will be required to turn in written answers to reviewing faculty, but will be required to give an oral response as well. This method of assessment will allow the students to see what skills they need to focus on in the latter part of their college careers. The questions will be | 75% of native sophomores (e.g. those who have matriculated solely at MUW) participating in the Survey are expected to score on the Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition Project Rubric a "strong pass" in two of the three following categories: performance/presentation; craftsmanship; and interpretation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 1 out of 1 Sophomore met the requirement | We will revisit this after next year when we have more Sophomores participating, but we see no reason to change our assessment method at this time. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | | | scored using the department's own "SOPHOMORE/TRANSFER INTERVIEW/AUDITION PROJECT" Rubric. | 75% of native sophomores (e.g. those who have matriculated solely at MUW) participating in the Survey are expected to score on the Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition Project Rubric a "strong pass" in two of the three following categories: performance/presentation; craftsmanship; and interpretation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 1 out of 1 Sophomore met the requirement | We will revisit this after next year when we have more Sophomores participating, but we see no reason to change our assessment method at this time. |
| | | | Originally, assessment was rotated with graduating Seniors being reported in odd-numbered years and sophomore review taking place in even-numbered years. Until the number of students is sufficient to support this protocol, both methods of assessment will be used every year. Sophomore and first year transfer review will take place at the end of the Fall semester and Senior exit portfolios will take place in the last two weeks of the Spring semester. The Department intends to assign a date for the "exit portfolio review." On that date graduating seniors will present an "acting portfolio" and/or a "technical theatre portfolio" to the faculty. The Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition | | | | | |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | Project Rubric will be use to assess the level of expertise in the student’s chosen area of presentation. | 75% of native sophomores (e.g. those who have matriculated solely at MUW) participating in the Survey are expected to score on the Sophomore/Transfer Interview/Audition Project Rubric a “strong pass” in two of the three following categories: performance/presentation; craftsmanship; and interpretation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 1 out of 1 Sophomore met the requirement | We will revisit this after next year when we have more Sophomores participating, but we see no reason to change our assessment method at this time. |
| | | | Oral interpretation (TH205) introduces students to voice and speech skills. The AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric is used to measure specific technical proficiency. Monologues and scene work in the beginning through advanced acting classes (TH 219, TH 319, TH 419) offer students a wide variety of texts to hone skills. These texts span a number of eras and genres offering different stylistic material. | Each student is expected to improve upon his/her oral and written presentations each semester from the time they enter the university until they graduate. 90% of students are expected to meet proficiency on the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric. Proficiency is achieved by a score of “3” or better in all 5 categories. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Inconclusive. There was one graduating senior, who missed the Proficiency target, but barely. | There was one graduating senior, so more data is needed. the one graduate missed the Proficiency target, but barely. |
| | | | Assessment forms are completed for each performance and expectations | | | | | |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | become more rigorous with each advanced course. In Design and Directing (TH 275 and TH 320) students make oral presentations to support three-dimensional works. Because the sequence of the listed courses may vary for each student, each student is monitored individually for ongoing improvement. Since we are a small program, it is necessary to rotate the assessment of goals. In order to have a reasonable sampling of sophomores, a file will be kept on all students until there are enough sophomore files to review; likewise, for graduates. | Each student is expected to improve upon his/her oral and written presentations each semester from the time they enter the university until they graduate. 90% of students are expected to meet proficiency on the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric. Proficiency is achieved by a score of "3" or better in all 5 categories. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Inconclusive. There was one graduating senior, who missed the Proficiency target, but barely. | There was one graduating senior, so more data is needed. the one graduate missed the Proficiency target, but barely. |
| | | | Originally, assessment was rotated with graduating Seniors being reported in odd-numbered years and sophomore review taking place in even-numbered years. Until the number of students is sufficient | | | | | |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | to support this protocol, both methods of assessment will be used every year. Sophomore and first year transfer review will take place at the end of the Fall semester and Senior exit portfolios will take place in the last two weeks of the Spring semester. The Department intends to assign a date for the "exit portfolio review." On that date graduating seniors will present an "acting portfolio" and/or a "technical theatre portfolio" to the faculty. The AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric will be use to assess the level of expertise in the student's chosen area of presentation. | Each student is expected to improve upon his/her oral and written presentations each semester from the time they enter the university until they graduate. 90% of students are expected to meet proficiency on the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric. Proficiency is achieved by a score of "3" or better in all 5 categories. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Inconclusive. There was one graduating senior, who missed the Proficiency target, but barely. | There was one graduating senior, so more data is needed. the one graduate missed the Proficiency target, but barely. |
| | | | Oral interpretation (TH205) introduces students to voice and speech skills. The AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric is used to measure specific technical proficiency. Monologues and scene work in the | Each student is expected to improve upon his/her oral and written presentations each semester from the time they enter the university until they graduate. 90% of students are expected to meet proficiency on the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric upon | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | There was one graduating senior and he missed the target, but barely. | Upon hindsight, this rubric seems out of place for use in the Senior Exit Project. It is used to better effect in SLO 2.2. We need to look at more graduating seniors. We foresee more than one graduating senior next year. If it still seems like unnecessary in this case, we may remove this particular assessment. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | beginning through advanced acting classes (TH 219, TH 319, TH 419) offer students a wide variety of texts to hone skills. These texts span a number of eras and genres offering different stylistic material. | graduation. Proficiency is achieved by a score of "3" or better in all 5 categories. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | There was one graduating senior and he missed the target, but barely. | Upon hindsight, this rubric seems out of place for use in the Senior Exit Project. It is used to better effect in SLO 2.2. We need to look at more graduating seniors. We foresee more than one graduating senior next year. If it still seems like unnecessary in this case, we may remove this particular assessment. |
| | | | Assessment forms are completed for each performance and expectations become more rigorous with each advanced course. In Design and Directing (TH 275 and TH 320) students make oral presentations to support three-dimensional works. Because the sequence of the listed courses may vary for each student, each student is monitored individually for ongoing improvement. Since we are a small program, it is necessary to rotate the assessment of goals. In order to have a reasonable sampling of sophomores, a file will be kept on all students until there are enough | | | | | |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | sophomore files to review; likewise, for graduates. Originally, assessment was rotated with graduating Seniors being reported in odd-numbered years and sophomore review taking place in even-numbered years. Until the number of students is sufficient to support this protocol, both methods of assessment will be used every year. Sophomore and first year transfer review will take place at the end of the Fall semester and Senior exit portfolios will take place in the last two weeks of the Spring semester. The Department intends to assign a date for the "exit portfolio review." On that date graduating seniors will present either and "acting portfolio" and/or a "technical theatre portfolio" to the faculty. The AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric will be use to assess the level of expertise in the | Each student is expected to improve upon his/her oral and written presentations each semester from the time they enter the university until they graduate. 90% of students are expected to meet proficiency on the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric upon graduation. Proficiency is achieved by a score of "3" or better in all 5 categories. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | There was one graduating senior and he missed the target, but barely. | Upon hindsight, this rubric seems out of place for use in the Senior Exit Project. It is used to better effect in SLO 2.2. We need to look at more graduating seniors. We foresee more than one graduating senior next year. If it still seems like unnecessary in this case, we may remove this particular assessment. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | student's chosen area of presentation. | Each student is expected to improve upon his/her oral and written presentations each semester from the time they enter the university until they graduate. 90% of students are expected to meet proficiency on the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric upon graduation. Proficiency is achieved by a score of "3" or better in all 5 categories. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | There was one graduating senior and he missed the target, but barely. | Upon hindsight, this rubric seems out of place for use in the Senior Exit Project. It is used to better effect in SLO 2.2. We need to look at more graduating seniors. We foresee more than one graduating senior next year. If it still seems like unnecessary in this case, we may remove this particular assessment. |
| | 2.1 (GEO 5.a., PO 4.d., SAO) | Students will increase their skills of professionalism and work ethics by performing assigned tasks with diligence, reliability, and punctuality. | All sophomore and first-year students will be reviewed at the end of the Fall semester (last week of regular classes). They are given a four question Survey in advance that allows them to self-assess their own growth as theatre artists (see attached doc, "Questions for Sophomore Review." Departmental faculty will review and analyze the results of the Survey to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of students participating in the Survey will state that their goal upon graduating the Theatre program is to have the skillset to gain employment or a long-term internship in theatre or a related field. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 6 of 7 students (86%) stated that their goal was to have the skill set necessary for employment in a related field. This was gleaned from questions three and four on the survey. | This is the first time using this particular assessment and upon review, it may be a bit vague. We will reexamine it's effectiveness after the next Sophomore Review. Also, we need a larger sample group to measure the effectiveness of this outcome. |
| | | | At the end of students' internships, departmental faculty will send the | 90% graduating seniors who completed an Internship will receive favorable | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 1 out of 1 graduating Senior received a favorable recommendation from the internship | Our internship has proven to be extremely successful over the years. We believe it is because of the rigorous training in work habits and rehearsal procedures. We will |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|--------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | <p>External Supervisor Review Questionnaire (see below) to the immediate supervisor to validate the students' accounts of their performance and conduct and to determine if the supervisor will give the student(s) a favorable recommendation.</p> | <p>recommendation from their external internship supervisor.</p> | <p>2016 - 2017</p> | <p>Target Met</p> | <p>supervisor. The Senior was hired for the following summer by the supervisor and received a promotion.</p> | <p>continue on this path.</p> |
| | | | <p>1. "The student" describes his/her duties as thus (edited):</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>Would you describe that description as accurate?</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>2. Overall, how would you rate the student's job performance? Excellent, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Unacceptable.</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>Please feel free to add any additional comments.</p> | | | | | |
| | | | <p>3. Based on the student's performance this summer, would you considering hiring "the student" again in a similar position?</p> | | | | | |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|--|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review graduating seniors' records to determine if an internship was completed. | 100% of graduating students will complete an Internship with a professional theatre company. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 1 out of 1 graduating Senior successfully completed the required internship. | Our internship has proven to be extremely successful over the years. We believe it is because of the rigorous training in work habits and rehearsal procedures. We will continue on this path. |
| | | | Attendance is strictly monitored in all departmental courses and for all rehearsals and work calls. All students enrolled in TH 400-The Theatre Practicum-will be evaluated using the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. | It is expected that the freshmen, sophomores and first year transfers participating in TH 400 will meet proficiency on the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. Proficiency is defined by averaging a score of "3" in at least 3 categories for freshmen, sophomores and first year transfers. Students must show proficiency before being allowed to complete Internship and/or graduate. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 8 of 12 students (62%) met the proficiency benchmark. The average score on the Teamwork Rubric for Sophomores, Freshmen and 1st-Year Transfers was 2.4. | Upon review, a percentage threshold was never set for this SLO. Using other assessments as precedent, we feel 60% is a good threshold for this Outcome. |
| | | | Attendance is strictly monitored in all departmental courses and for all rehearsals and work calls. All students enrolled in TH 400-The Theatre Practicum-will be evaluated using the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. | Juniors and Seniors in TH 400 will meet proficiency on the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE Rubric. Proficiency for juniors and seniors is defined by averaging a score of "3" or better in all 5 categories. Students must show proficiency before being allowed to complete Internship and/or graduate. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | 16 out of 21 students (76%) met proficiency in this assessment. The average score on the Teamwork Rubric for Juniors and Seniors was 2.9. | Upon review, a percentage threshold has not been set for this Outcome. We feel that 75% is a good threshold, as it is the average between the common threshold for Freshman and Sophomores (60%) and the common threshold for graduating seniors(90%). |
| | | | Attendance is | 90% of Juniors and | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not | 31 out of 39 | Based on direct observation of the |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------------|---|--|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | | | strictly monitored in all departmental courses and for all rehearsals and work calls. Students are evaluated by the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric for their participation in the major productions of both the Fall and Spring semesters. | Seniors in the major semester productions will meet proficiency on the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric. Proficiency for juniors and seniors is achieved by a score of "3" or better in all 5 categories. Students must show proficiency before being allowed to complete Internship and/or graduate. | 2016 - 2017 | Met | students (80%) gained proficiency, which does not meet the threshold of this assessment. Bear in mind that this assessment is done for two different productions, so most students were assessed twice. | positive accomplishments of this group, it seems that our target threshold is too high. If it were Seniors alone, 90 % would be acceptable, but factoring in Juniors-who have less experience in the rehearsal process and have probably not completed a professional internship at the time-it seems more reasonable to drop the Proficiency Threshold to 75% (the average between the common Freshman/Sophomore threshold of 60% and the Senior norm of 90%). |
| | | | Attendance is strictly monitored in all departmental courses and for all rehearsals and work calls. Students are evaluated by the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric for their participation in the major productions of both the Fall and Spring semesters. | It is expected that 60% of freshmen, sophomores and first year transfers participating in the major semester productions will meet proficiency on the AAC&U Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric. Proficiency is defined by achieving a score of "3" in at least 3 categories for freshmen, sophomores and first year transfers. Students must show proficiency before being allowed to complete Internship and/or graduate. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 11 out of 15 students (73%) achieved proficiency in this assessment, which meets the benchmark. | We plan to continue on this course. We feel the success of this outcome is a rigorous reinforcement of a good work ethic and a professional rehearsal demeanor |
| | 2.2 (SLO & PO 4.d.) | Students will develop an accountable character by demonstrating the ability to manage their own time effectively, as well as work well with others in collaborative projects, | TH 400 is assessed jointly by 3 faculty members based on ability to meet project deadlines and collaborative skills. Post Mortems | 60% of Sophomores should demonstrate proficiency in this area. Proficiency for Sophomores is defined as scoring at least a 90 in two | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 8 of 9 students (896%) achieved proficiency in this assessment. | The percentage of students is satisfactory. We feel that our course of training, relying on participation in actual theatre productions, is an effective strategy. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------------|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 2.2 (SLO & PO 4.d.) | and to serve as leaders of peer groups. | (of each theatre production team) are held to track effectiveness of collaboration and are all evaluated using the Creative Project Grading Rubric developed by the faculty. | categories and no lower than a 80 (B-) in the other two categories on the Creative Project Grading Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 8 of 9 students (896%) achieved proficiency in this assessment. | The percentage of students is satisfactory. We feel that our course of training, relying on participation in actual theatre productions, is an effective strategy. |
| | | | TH 400 is assessed jointly by 3 faculty members based on ability to meet project deadlines and collaborative skills. Post Mortems (of each theatre production team) are held to track effectiveness of collaboration and are all evaluated using the Creative Project Grading Rubric developed by the faculty. | 90% of graduating Seniors should demonstrate proficiency in this area. Proficiency for graduating seniors in this area is defined as scoring at least a 90 (A-) in at least three categories and no lower than an 80 (B-) in the one other category on the Creative Project Grading Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There was one graduating Senior this year and he met the proficiency. As a matter of course, we added all seniors and the result was 90%. | We need more Graduating Seniors to make a determination of the efficiency of this assessment. |
| | 2.3 (SLO & SAO) | Students will effectively demonstrate their comprehension and developed abilities by synthesizing the sum of their knowledge gleaned in the Theatre curriculum to independently devise a creative piece with a unique point of view. | During the student's Senior year, it is expected that the student will be able to independently craft a creative work in at least one area of practical Theatre production and performance. Examples include: acting, directing, scene painting and costume design. The student will utilize practical skills learned in second-year and some third- | 90% of graduating seniors are expected to achieve Proficiency. Proficiency is defined as scoring at least 90% (A-) on the Creative Project Grading Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 1 out of 1 graduating Seniors met this proficiency. Other seniors were not added because this is based solely on the Senior Exit Project-which is only done by graduating Seniors. | We are changing to the Senior Exit Project Rubric (see related document), because it has a much narrower and more specific focus than the Creative Project Rubric. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|-----------------|--|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 2.3 (SLO & SAO) | Students will effectively demonstrate their comprehension and developed abilities by synthesizing the sum of their knowledge gleaned in the Theatre curriculum to independently devise a creative piece with a unique point of view. | year classes (TH 217-Stage Crafts; TH 219-Beginning Acting; TH 275-Introduction to Design; TH 318-Stage Lighting, and TH 319-Intermediate Acting). These skills will be mastered in more advanced classes (TH 320-Directing; TH 419-Advanced Acting; and TH 400-Theatre Practicum). The individual achievement to be assessed will be chosen by the student, with the consent of the Theatre faculty, during the Senior Exit Project. The project will be graded using the departmental Creative Project Grading Rubric. | 90% of graduating seniors are expected to achieve Proficiency. Proficiency is defined as scoring at least 90% (A-) on the Creative Project Grading Rubric. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 1 out of 1 graduating Seniors met this proficiency. Other seniors were not added because this is based solely on the Senior Exit Project-which is only done by graduating Seniors. | We are changing to the Senior Exit Project Rubric (see related document), because it has a much narrower and more specific focus than the Creative Project Rubric. |
| Program - Women's Leadership - MA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (RO) | Through finding, examining and analyzing primary and secondary sources, the students will practice graduate level research skills on both assigned and self-generated topics on women's leadership. | Graduate students will complete at least one Annotated Bibliography demonstrating research and source quality assessment skills on a self-selected topic. Either the director or a designated WS faculty member will assess the annotated bibliography using | In a sample set of at least three annotated bibliographies from either WS 500 or WS 502 sections, each of the essays will earn an average score of 3.5 or higher on the AAC&U Rubric on Information Literacy. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | In academic year five graduate students completed WS 500, the "gateway" course for the MA in Women's Leadership. All five of them earned point scores which earned them at least an A- (90 points) on their Annotated Bibliography | We will continue to collect and assess the completed Annotated Bibliography Assignments in WS 500. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|---|----------------|---|--|---|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Program - Women's Leadership - MA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (RO) | Through finding, examining and analyzing primary and secondary sources, the students will practice graduate level research skills on both assigned and self-generated topics on women's leadership. | the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Information Literacy. | In a sample set of at least three annotated bibliographies from either WS 500 or WS 502 sections, each of the essays will earn an average score of 3.5 or higher on the AAC&U Rubric on Information Literacy. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Assignment (see attached assignment document which also includes the class rubric for the assignment). The AAC&U Value Rubric in Information Literacy was applied to these same five completed assignments and the scores were as follows: Student 1 - 4; Student 2 - 3.8; student 3 - 4; Student 4 - 3.2; Student 5 - 4. All of the students met the target of 3.5 or higher on this Value Rubric (see attached IL Value Rubric) except one. This student Four is actually a graduate student in another program at MUW, but is considering adding the MA in WL as a second degree. Although she scored below the Achievement Target, she is very capable of moving further in our program. | We will continue to collect and assess the completed Annotated Bibliography Assignments in WS 500. |
| | 1.2 (SLO & RO) | Through analysis of secondary sources the students will learn to assess the quality of secondary research on both assigned and self- | The director of the program will assess a completed WS 500 or WS 502 article review assignment using AAC&U VALUE | Each of the students completing the assignment for "Article Review II" in the graduate course WS 500 or any of the | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | In academic year five graduate students completed WS 500, the "gateway" course for the MA in | We will continue to collect and assess the completed annotated bibliography assignments with the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|---------------------------------|--|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | 1.2 (SLO & RO) | generated topics in women's leadership. | Rubric on Inquiry and Analysis. | article review or critique assignments in WS: 502 will average at least a 3.5 using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Inquiry and Analysis. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Women's Leadership. All five of them earned point scores which earned them at least an A- (90 points) on their Annotated Bibliography Assignment (see attached assignment document which includes the class rubric for the annotated bibliography assignment). The AAC&U Value Rubric in Inquiry and Analysis was applied to these same five completed assignments and the scores were as follows: Student 1 - 4; Student 2 - 4; student 3 - 4; Student 4 - 3; Student 5 - 3.8. All of the students met the target of 3.5 or higher on this Value Rubric (see attached IL Value Rubric) except one. This student Four is actually a graduate student in another program at MUW, but is considering adding the MA in WL as a second degree. Although she scored below the Achievement | We will continue to collect and assess the completed annotated bibliography assignments with the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|---|--|---|------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | 1.2 (SLO & RO) | Through analysis of secondary sources the students will learn to assess the quality of secondary research on both assigned and self-generated topics in women's leadership. | The director of the program will assess a completed WS 500 or WS 502 article review assignment using AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Inquiry and Analysis. | Each of the students completing the assignment for "Article Review II" in the graduate course WS 500 or any of the article review or critique assignments in WS: 502 will average at least a 3.5 using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Inquiry and Analysis. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Not Met | Target, she is very capable of moving further in our program. | We will continue to collect and assess the completed annotated bibliography assignments with the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric |
| | 1.3 (SLO & RO) | The student will produce a master's level project/thesis with a review of relevant literature and analysis of primary and secondary sources, based on an original idea connected with the development of leadership in women and girls. | The students Capstone/Thesis committee (consisting of a director and two other faculty members) will assess the completed project in WS 512: Capstone/Thesis using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Integrative Learning. | A student's WS 512 Capstone/Thesis project will score an average of no less than 3.5 on the AAC&U VALUE RUBRIC on Integrative Learning. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | In the 2016-17 academic year, the first person completed her WS Capstone Thesis Project, successfully defended it to her committee, and was granted the MA in Women's Leadership. Her thesis title was Development of a Curriculum Guide for Young Women's Leadership Program. It included a thorough review of literature and primary source examples, including interviews with directors of similar programs. She used all of this information, integrated it into her own new ideas for a curriculum, and succeeded in creating an original curriculum. She | We have two graduate students on track to complete thesis in the 2017-2018 academic year. We will assess their completed WS 512 theses/Capstone projects with the AACU Value Rubric on Integrative Learning. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|----------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 1.3 (SLO & RO) | The student will produce a master's level project/thesis with a review of relevant literature and analysis of primary and secondary sources, based on an original idea connected with the development of leadership in women and girls. | The students Capstone/Thesis committee (consisting of a director and two other faculty members) will assess the completed project in WS 512: Capstone/Thesis using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Integrative Learning. | A student's WS 512 Capstone/Thesis project will score an average of no less than 3.5 on the AAC&U VALUE RUBRIC on Integrative Learning. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | earned an A from her Thesis Committee, and a 3.8 score on the Value Rubric in Integrative Learning. | We have two graduate students on track to complete thesis in the 2017-2018 academic year. We will assess their completed WS 512 theses/Capstone projects with the AACU Value Rubric on Integrative Learning. |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | The students will complete direct mentor or internship experience with a woman who works in a non-traditional field, in a political, educational or non-profit organization with a connection to improving women's lives, or in a field which documents women's lives and experiences. | At the end of their mentoring or internship experience, students will complete a "Reflective Essay" including evidence of intellectual and personal growth in their hands-on knowledge of both the diversity and commonalities of women's experiences. The Director of the Program will assess the reflection essays. | 100% of students who complete WS 510 (required practicum) will be able to describe at least two specific examples of personal or intellectual growth in their knowledge about women's leadership skills gained during their mentoring or internship experience. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Three students completed WS 510: Practicum/Field Experience in Women's Leadership during the 2016-17 year and earned A's in the course. One student during the summer of 2016 worked with a non-profit women's organization for a month in Africa. Two students completed internships for NEW Leadership Mississippi (see url link) under the direction of the staff at the Center for Outreach and Innovation and the Center for Women's Research and Public Policy at MUW. All three earned "Exemplary" in both categories on the | We will continue to assess all students who complete WS 510 by applying a department rubric to their final reflection paper. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 2.1 (SLO) | The students will complete direct mentor or internship experience with a woman who works in a non-traditional field, in a political, educational or non-profit organization with a connection to improving women's lives, or in a field which documents women's lives and experiences. | At the end of their mentoring or internship experience, students will complete a "Reflective Essay" including evidence of intellectual and personal growth in their hands-on knowledge of both the diversity and commonalities of women's experiences. The Director of the Program will assess the reflection essays. | 100% of students who complete WS 510 (required practicum) will be able to describe at least two specific examples of personal or intellectual growth in their knowledge about women's leadership skills gained during their mentoring or internship experience. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | WS 510 Reflection essay rubric (see attached document). | We will continue to assess all students who complete WS 510 by applying a department rubric to their final reflection paper. |
| | | | The women leaders who act as mentors or as supervisors in WS 510 will complete a Satisfaction Survey about the student's participation. | At least 85% of students who complete the WS 510 practicum will earn a score of 3 "satisfactory" or 4 "highly satisfactory" (on a four point range from 1 Unsatisfactory, 2 Slightly dissatisfied, 3 Satisfactory to 4 Highly Satisfactory) from their mentor/supervisor. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two different women supervised the three WS 510 students in the 2016-17 academic year. They scored each of the three students' efforts and success in WS 510 as "4," or "highly satisfactory." | We will continue to assess all students who complete WS 510 in an academic year by surveying their mentors. |
| | 3.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will take a variety of graduate level coursework in Education, Business and Professional Studies, Nursing, Public Health, History/Political Science/Public Policy, and or Literature. | The student course schedule in which the student is registered in Banner Web during every semester of the program after the first semester. After the first semester of graduate work, which will generally consist of | 100% of MA in Women's Leadership graduates will complete graduate level coursework in at least three other areas with prefixes other than WS. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | During the 2016-17 academic year all six graduate students were enrolled in a variety of other graduate courses which had a significant content about women's issues/experiences or women's leadership. (One of | The MA in WL advisor will continue to make sure that students are enrolled in at least one mutually agreeable non WS graduate course after the first gateway courses are completed. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 3.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will take a variety of graduate level coursework in Education, Business and Professional Studies, Nursing, Public Health, History/Political Science/Public Policy, and or Literature. | enrollment in WS 500, WS 501 and WS 502, the student and advisor will work together to select for registration in at least one mutually agreeable course per semester in other graduate programs at MUW which do not have the WS prefix, but also offer significant women's issues or women's leadership content. | 100% of MA in Women's Leadership graduates will complete graduate level coursework in at least three other areas with prefixes other than WS. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | these six graduate students has since been dismissed from the MA in WL program since she failed a another discipline's graduate class in which she was enrolled). One of the six is actually in another graduate program at MUW, but has indicated that she plans on completing both master's degrees, and therefore is actually enrolled in a majority of another discipline's programs. The prefixes of the other graduate courses they took included ED, HED, MGT, PLG and MIS. | The MA in WL advisor will continue to make sure that students are enrolled in at least one mutually agreeable non WS graduate course after the first gateway courses are completed. |
| | 3.2 (PO 4.d.) | Students who take a variety of graduate level coursework in Education, Business and Professional Studies, Nursing, Public Health, History/Political Science/Public Policy, and or Literature will complete papers or projects in those classes with either a direct or indirect focus on women's issues or women's leadership. | The program director will apply a simple check off rubric to a sample group of at least five papers from at least three graduate level courses taken in other disciplines by Women's Leadership graduate students over the academic year. | The program director will collect a sample set of at least five papers from at least three graduate level courses taken in other disciplines by program students over the academic year, and using a simple check off method (1. Paper or project DOES MEET the women's issues content expectations of the MS in Women's Leadership Program or 2. Paper or Project DOES NOT meet the women's issues | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | This analysis was not done completely as described in the Achievement Target. Rather than requesting papers and checking the content, the director contacted the faculty members to find out if the MA in Women's Leadership students had completed projects dealing with women's issues in content. During | Next year the director will actually collect the sample set of papers from the faculty members as the Achievement Target describes, and review them herself, and keep them on file for review. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 3.2 (PO 4.d.) | Students who take a variety of graduate level coursework in Education, Business and Professional Studies, Nursing, Public Health, History/Political Science/Public Policy, and or Literature will complete papers or projects in those classes with either a direct or indirect focus on women's issues or women's leadership. | The program director will apply a simple check off rubric to a sample group of at least five papers from at least three graduate level courses taken in other disciplines by Women's Leadership graduate students over the academic year. | content expectations), 90 % of students in the program will produce papers or projects which DO MEET the content expectation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | the 2016-17 academic year all six graduate students were enrolled in a variety of other graduate courses which had a significant content about women's issues/experiences or women's leadership. (One of these six graduate students has since been dismissed from the MA in WL program since she failed a another discipline's graduate class in which she was enrolled). One of the six is actually in another graduate program at MUW, but has indicated that she plans on completing both master's degrees, and therefore is actually enrolled in a majority of another discipline's programs. The prefixes of the other graduate courses they took included ED, HED, MGT, PLG and MIS. If the work of the student who failed one of the upper level courses is eliminated, and the work of the student who has not yet formally declared a | Next year the director will actually collect the sample set of papers from the faculty members as the Achievement Target describes, and review them herself, and keep them on file for review. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | 3.2 (PO 4.d.) | Students who take a variety of graduate level coursework in Education, Business and Professional Studies, Nursing, Public Health, History/Political Science/Public Policy, and or Literature will complete papers or projects in those classes with either a direct or indirect focus on women's issues or women's leadership. | The program director will apply a simple check off rubric to a sample group of at least five papers from at least three graduate level courses taken in other disciplines by Women's Leadership graduate students over the academic year. | The program director will collect a sample set of at least five papers from at least three graduate level courses taken in other disciplines by program students over the academic year, and using a simple check off method (1. Paper or project DOES MEET the women's issues content expectations of the MS in Women's Leadership Program or 2. Paper or Project DOES NOT meet the women's issues content expectations), 90 % of students in the program will produce papers or projects which DO MEET the content expectation. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | second major in MA in WL is eliminated, the work of four students who completed work in seven non WS classes can be considered. Faculty in those courses confirm that in at least five papers by the four remaining students, in graduate classes not prefixed with WS, ALL of the papers had significant content in women's issues. | Next year the director will actually collect the sample set of papers from the faculty members as the Achievement Target describes, and review them herself, and keep them on file for review. |
| | 4.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will receive a quality women's studies education. | At the end of the academic year, surveys will be taken of program completers. Departmental faculty will review and analyze the Capstone Survey results. | 90% of students participating in the Capstone Survey will indicate a "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" satisfaction level reflective of the women's studies curriculum, hands-on learning opportunities and quality of instruction. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Overall the December 2016 graduate indicated that she was "very satisfied" with her degree. She graduated with a 4.00 average. (see attached survey for list of all questions.) She added a strength not mentioned on the survey: " I persevere in getting meetings scheduled with people with whom I feel I need to meet. I do not give up on | Next year two more graduate students are on schedule to complete their degrees. We will have both of them complete the Graduate Capstone/Graduate Survey. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|---|
| | 4.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will receive a quality women's studies education. | At the end of the academic year, surveys will be taken of program completers. Departmental faculty will review and analyze the Capstone Survey results. | 90% of students participating in the Capstone Survey will indicate a "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" satisfaction level reflective of the women's studies curriculum, hands-on learning opportunities and quality of instruction. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | any task. I even flew to another state to interview the director of a program I wanted more information about. I am also very organized and self-motivated." In self-describing a weakness, she said "I have had trouble on projects when I don't have an exact template to follow." She said that her courses were "challenging." About the level of difficulty of her WS prefix classes, she said "The reading and research were rewarding, but satisfying and I was interested in the content." About the level of difficulty in her non-WS prefix classes she said, "They were often difficult (Health and Education) because I felt I needed to catch up on background knowledge to do well in the classes (but since I graduated with a 4.0, I think I overcame this difficulty)." She described her coursework as "eye-opening" and that it | Next year two more graduate students are on schedule to complete their degrees. We will have both of them complete the Graduate Capstone/Graduate Survey. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|---|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 4.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will receive a quality women's studies education. | At the end of the academic year, surveys will be taken of program completers. Departmental faculty will review and analyze the Capstone Survey results. | 90% of students participating in the Capstone Survey will indicate a "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" satisfaction level reflective of the women's studies curriculum, hands-on learning opportunities and quality of instruction. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | was "somewhat easy" to get the courses she wanted when she needed them. She added "My degree gave me the ability to create a new leadership curriculum for middle and high school girls, and to write a successful grant for my local public school in my last semester" and that her most valuable experience was "Learning that I AM a leader, and gaining confidence about that fact." | Next year two more graduate students are on schedule to complete their degrees. We will have both of them complete the Graduate Capstone/Graduate Survey. |
| | | | Women's Studies faculty (a group of at least three faculty) who attend the students' Graduate Capstone/Thesis presentations and review the final projects will score the students' work using the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics on Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Integrative Learning. | 100% of students completing WS 512: Capstone/Thesis will average least a 3.5 (upper level milestone) score or higher on all three AAU&C VALUE rubrics applied to their final projects. An average of the faculty committee's scores will be used to determine the students' final scores. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | The thesis director and two other faculty members and one guest attended the first graduate's thesis presentation and defense in late November. The director and other faculty scored her presentation with the Oral Communication Value rubric, and all gave her "4" ratings. The three also applied the Rubrics for Critical Thinking and Integrative Learning to her thesis document. She received 4's | There are two graduate students scheduled to complete next year, and we will apply all three rubrics to their thesis document/presentation/defense. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|---|---|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | | | Women's Studies faculty (a group of at least three faculty) who attend the students' Graduate Capstone/Thesis presentations and review the final projects will score the students' work using the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics on Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Integrative Learning. | 100% of students completing WS 512: Capstone/Thesis will average least a 3.5 (upper level milestone) score or higher on all three AAU&C VALUE rubrics applied to their final projects. An average of the faculty committee's scores will be used to determine the students' final scores. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | from all on the Integrative Learning rubric and a 3.8 average on the Critical Thinking rubric. | There are two graduate students scheduled to complete next year, and we will apply all three rubrics to their thesis document/presentation/defense. |
| | 4.2 (SAO) | Students will be actively engaged using their master's degrees in Women's Leadership. | The Alumni Survey is sent out every three years. The next rotation will be in 2019, 2022, and so on. At the end of the academic year, the program director will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | 15% of students participating in the Alumni Survey will state that they are enrolled in a higher level graduate/professional degree program connected with their master's degree in women's studies. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The MUW Alumni Survey is set to be issued next in 2019, and we look forward to the data which will be collected. | We look forward to the data which will be collected beginning in 2019 by the MUW Alumni Survey. |
| | | | The Alumni Survey is sent out every three years. The next rotation will be in 2019, 2022, and so on. At the end of the academic year, the program director will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | 75% of former students participating in the Alumni Survey will state that they are currently working in their field of study or in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the master's program. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The MUW Alumni Survey is set to be issued next in 2019, and we look forward to the data which will be collected. | We look forward to the data which will be collected beginning in 2019 by the MUW Alumni Survey. |
| | | | The Departmental Social Media Survey is sent out on the | 5% increase from the previous academic year of Women's | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | We have not yet completed a full year since the first | We will plan to do a social media survey of graduates at the end of the spring 2019 semester. The |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|---|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | | | Program Facebook page every year. At the end of the academic year, the director faculty will analyze and compare the survey results to the previous academic year to determine if there was an increase or decrease in employment or further graduate study. | Studies alumni students participating in the Official Departmental Social Media Survey stating that they are either employed in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the master's program or are enrolled in a higher level graduate/professional program connected with women's leadership. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | graduate completed her degree. We plan to begin collecting this data beginning in May of 2018, when we should have three graduates. | director is in social media and email contact with the one graduate and all current graduate students. |
| Program - Women's Studies (including Minor) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.b. & 2.c.) | The students will be able to analyze, in written form, issues dealing with the global, historical, political, psychological, sociological, biological, and/or religious aspects of women's lives. | In a sample group of at least 10 essays from the final exams of at least two sections of WS 200, with two women's studies faculty members scoring using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Critical Thinking, students enrolled in WS 200: Introduction to Women's Studies will demonstrate the ability to write a final exam essay analyzing two or more of the global historical, political, psychological, sociological, biological, and/or religious aspects of women's lives. | Non-women's studies majors or minors' writing will score an average of at least a 2 (lower milestone level) or higher using the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Critical Thinking. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | A sample group of 13 papers from 2016-2017 WS exam essays were analyzed by applying the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric. (see WS 200 rubric data document in document repository). A total of 66 students registered for WS 200 in 2016-17. Only six students (1 WP and five F's) did not complete the course. The thirteen essays represent a little over 20 percent of the students completing the course. Of the thirteen essays, 9 were non-women's studies majors or | We will continue to collect papers to assess, and try to have a more uniform exam assignment between the two faculty members who teach WS 200 |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|--|-----------------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| Program - Women's Studies (including Minor) - BA {2016-2017} | 1.1 (GEO 1.b. & 2.c.) | The students will be able to analyze, in written form, issues dealing with the global, historical, political, psychological, sociological, biological, and/or religious aspects of women's lives. | In a sample group of at least 10 essays from the final exams of at least two sections of WS 200, with two women's studies faculty members scoring using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Critical Thinking, students enrolled in WS 200: Introduction to Women's Studies will demonstrate the ability to write a final exam essay analyzing two or more of the global historical, political, psychological, sociological, biological, and/or religious aspects of women's lives. | Non-women's studies majors or minors' writing will score an average of at least a 2 (lower milestone level) or higher using the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Critical Thinking. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | minors. Those nine students scored a total overall average of 2.73 on the rubric, with only one essay scoring below the lower milestone level of 2 (essay 1 - 1.6). The highest score was a 4. In general, the non-major or minor students did very well, in fact, better than expected (All of them except one student met or exceeded the target of 2 (lower milestone level). Two scored Capstone Level or 4. Although these students could be taking this course as a general education class and be at freshmen or sophomore level, several of the non-majors were juniors or seniors taking the course as an elective, and were naturally inclined to self-select the class as more interesting to them. The older students tend to be more skilled in critical thinking, also. | We will continue to collect papers to assess, and try to have a more uniform exam assignment between the two faculty members who teach WS 200 |
| | | | In a sample group of at least 10 essays from the final exams | Women's studies majors or minors will score an average of at | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | A sample group of 13 papers from 2016-2017 WS exam | We will continue to collect papers to assess, and try to have a more uniform exam assignment between |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|-------------------|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | | of at least two sections of WS 200, with two women's studies faculty members scoring using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Critical Thinking, students enrolled in WS 200: Introduction to Women's Studies will demonstrate the ability to write a final exam essay analyzing two or more of the global historical, political, psychological, sociological, biological, and/or religious aspects of women's lives. | | least a 2.5 or higher (mid milestone level) using the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Critical Thinking. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | essays were analyzed by applying the AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric. (see WS 200 rubric data document in document repository). A total of 66 students registered for WS 200 in 2016-17. Only six students (1 WP and five F's) did not complete the course. The thirteen essays represent a little over 20 percent of the students completing the course. Of the thirteen essays, 4 were written by women's studies majors or minors. These students wrote papers 6 (4), 7 (3.2), 8 (4) and 9 (3.6). The numbers in parentheses are the scores on the rubric. This is an overall average of 3.7, which is well above the target of 2.5 (halfway between lower and upper milestone level). These scores could be higher than expected because women's studies students often do not declare a minor or major until they | the two faculty members who teach WS 200 (05/17/2017) |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action | |
|-----------|--------------|---------|-------------------|---|---|-------------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | | | In a sample group of at least 10 essays from the final exams of at least two sections of WS 200, with two women's studies faculty members scoring using the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Critical Thinking, students enrolled in WS 200: Introduction to Women's Studies will demonstrate the ability to write a final exam essay analyzing two or more of the global historical, political, psychological, sociological, biological, and/or religious aspects of women's lives. | Women's studies majors or minors will score an average of at least a 2.5 or higher (mid milestone level) using the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Critical Thinking. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | are past their general education curriculum. At this point, they are upper level students, but are enrolled in a required introductory level course, and perhaps have already taken 3 or 4 hundred level WS courses as electives. | We will continue to collect papers to assess, and try to have a more uniform exam assignment between the two faculty members who teach WS 200 (05/17/2017) |
| | | | | With the director of women's studies applying the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, in a sample group of at least 10 essays and/or discussion posts from students enrolled in WS 200 in one academic year, students enrolled in WS 200: Introduction to Women's Studies, will demonstrate the ability to write an | Students will score an average of at least a 2.5 or higher on the AAC&U Value Rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | A sample group of 13 papers from 2016-2017 WS exam essays were analyzed by applying the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value rubric. (see WS 200 rubric data document in document repository). A total of 66 students registered for WS 200 in 2016-17. Only six students (1 WP and five F's) did | We will continue to collect papers to assess, and the two faculty members who teach WS 200 will coordinate to have a more uniform exam question or discussion board assignment which directly asks about inter/multi-cultural knowledge. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|---|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | | essay or discussion post demonstrating the historical and current global and intercultural roles of women in society. | Students will score an average of at least a 2.5 or higher on the AAC&U Value Rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | not complete the course. The thirteen essays represent a little over 20 percent of the students completing the course. Of the thirteen essays, only 9 were non-women's studies majors or minors. Those nine students scored a total overall average of 2.51 on the rubric, with only one essay scoring below the lower milestone level of 2 (essay 11 - 1.8). The highest score was a 4. In general, the non-major or minor students did very well, in fact, better than expected (All of them except one student met or exceeded the target of 2 (lower milestone level), the remaining student was only slightly below the target. Although these students could be taking this course as a general education class and be at freshmen or sophomore level, several of the non-majors were juniors or seniors taking the course as an | We will continue to collect papers to assess, and the two faculty members who teach WS 200 will coordinate to have a more uniform exam question or discussion board assignment which directly asks about inter/multi-cultural knowledge. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | | With the director of women's studies applying the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence, in a sample group of at least 10 essays and/or discussion posts from students enrolled in WS 200 in one academic year, students enrolled in WS 200: Introduction to Women's Studies, will demonstrate the ability to write an essay or discussion post demonstrating the historical and current global and intercultural roles of women in society. | Students will score an average of at least a 2.5 or higher on the AAC&U Value Rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | elective, and were naturally inclined to self-select the class as more interesting to them. The older students tend to be more skilled in critical thinking, also. | We will continue to collect papers to assess, and the two faculty members who teach WS 200 will coordinate to have a more uniform exam question or discussion board assignment which directly asks about inter/multi-cultural knowledge. |
| | 1.2 (SAO) | By the completion of the minor or major program in women's studies, the students will complete a direct mentor or internship experience with a woman who works in a non-traditional field, in a non-profit organization with a connection to improving women's lives, or in a field which documents women's lives and experiences. | At the end of their mentoring or internship experience, students will complete a "Reflective Essay" including evidence of intellectual and personal growth in their hands-on knowledge of both the diversity and commonalities of women's experiences. Faculty will review and analyze the students' essays to determine if achievement target | 90% of students will be able to provide at least two specific examples of personal or intellectual growth in their knowledge about women's experiences which was gained during their mentoring or internship experience. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two students who graduated in 2016-7 finished with a student (student one) who completed a minor in women's studies with her BSN degree and one (student 2) who finished with an emphasis in women's studies in her Interdisciplinary Studies BA. Student 1 completed a transcribed diary, including historical research on the period of the diary, under the | We will continue to collect reflective essays from WS 400 internship students, but will also ask for reflective essays from internship courses in other disciplines in which minors and majors are enrolled. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|-------------------|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 1.2 (SAO) | By the completion of the minor or major program in women's studies, the students will complete a direct mentor or internship experience with a woman who works in a non-traditional field, in a non-profit organization with a connection to improving women's lives, or in a field which documents women's lives and experiences. | was met. | 90% of students will be able to provide at least two specific examples of personal or intellectual growth in their knowledge about women's experiences which was gained during their mentoring or internship experience. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | mentorship of the Director of Women's Studies. Among other things, in her reflection she pointed out how her WS 400 work had helped her to understand more about women's health problems in the past, and how to be more empathetic about people who live in poverty and can't afford health care. Student 2 completed WS 400 under the guidance of our University Archivist and the Chair of History, Political Science and Geography. Her project resulted in a paper and a public presentation about the experiences of the first six women who desegregated MUW in 1966. She presented her reflection paper at 2016 Homecoming, and talked about how, as an African American student, she had discovered more about "her" history in the institution from which she was graduating. Student 1 has a rubric score of "proficient" in | We will continue to collect reflective essays from WS 400 internship students, but will also ask for reflective essays from internship courses in other disciplines in which minors and majors are enrolled. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|--------------|--|--|
| | 1.2 (SAO) | By the completion of the minor or major program in women's studies, the students will complete a direct mentor or internship experience with a woman who works in a non-traditional field, in a non-profit organization with a connection to improving women's lives, or in a field which documents women's lives and experiences. | At the end of their mentoring or internship experience, students will complete a "Reflective Essay" including evidence of intellectual and personal growth in their hands-on knowledge of both the diversity and commonalities of women's experiences. Faculty will review and analyze the students' essays to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of students will be able to provide at least two specific examples of personal or intellectual growth in their knowledge about women's experiences which was gained during their mentoring or internship experience. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | both categories for her reflection paper, and Student 2 has a rubric score of "exemplary" on her reflection. (see rubric in attached document) | We will continue to collect reflective essays from WS 400 internship students, but will also ask for reflective essays from internship courses in other disciplines in which minors and majors are enrolled. |
| | 1.3 (SLO) | Senior majors will exhibit at least a proficient level in reading, writing and analytic skills. | Graduating MUW native senior Women's Studies majors and minors randomly selected to take the CLA+ test by the QEP director will decide to take the test (which is optional). Results will be reviewed and analyzed by faculty. | 90% of senior Women's Studies majors and minors will score at least Proficient in all tested areas on the CLA+ standardized test. This test targets the following areas (which also mirror MUW General Education Requirements): Analysis and Problem Solving; Writing Effectiveness; Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning; Critical Reading and Evaluation, and Critiquing an Argument. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | The student who graduated in 2016 was not selected to take the CLA+ | Minors or majors who have earned senior hours will specifically be asked by the director to take the CLA+ and will give their names to the QEP Director so that he may also contact them. |
| | 2.1 (SLO) | Students will exhibit the ability to conduct and | Faculty will review students' recorded | By the end of each academic year, at | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Twelve new MUW Alumnae Interviews | We will continue to collect at least 8 Golden Girl interviews per year, |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|---|
| | 2.1 (SLO) | record a structured interview of a woman. | oral histories and keep a log of all new oral histories of women that are added to the university archives for future student, faculty and scholar research. | least three new digital oral histories of women interviewed by women's studies majors or minors will be added to University archives for future research. The interview subjects will choose after the completed interview whether or not they wish the recording and written materials to be preserved for future research. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | of the class of 1967 were recorded during MUW Homecoming 2017 and officially donated to the Center for Women's Research and Public Policy and to the MUW Archives. A women's studies minor not only interviewed subjects herself, she trained nine other student interns who completed interviews under her guidance. | and will make sure that a major or minor is the student intern who trains and monitors the interviewers. The interviewers will make sure the interviewee is invited to sign the "Deed of Gift" of intellectual property to the MUW Archives and Center for Women and Public Policy. |
| | | | Women's Studies majors and minors will use oral history best practices, including collecting signed "deed of gift" forms from interviewees, preparing targeted questions, and digitally recording an oral history of a woman from a particular age group or professional group. Faculty will review and analyze the students' work. | By the time they graduate, 100% of Women's Studies minors and majors will successfully conduct and report in writing on at least two structured interviews of at least two women. These interviews will contain specific familial and biographical details, work history, educational history and gender relationship opinions (from the subject). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | This year one WS minor student trained and directed nine other students who completed and recorded interviews with 12 members of the class of 1967, included the signed "Deed of Gift" forms to add them to the files of the Center for Women's Research and Public Policy. One Interdisciplinary Studies student with an emphasis in women's studies completed several interviews with African American women for the projects leading to the university's 2016-2017 year of | We will continue to collect at least 8 Golden Girl interviews per year, and will make sure that a major or minor is the student intern who trains and monitors the interviewers. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | | Women's Studies majors and minors will use oral history best practices, including collecting signed "deed of gift" forms from interviewees, preparing targeted questions, and digitally recording an oral history of a woman from a particular age group or professional group. Faculty will review and analyze the students' work. | By the time they graduate, 100% of Women's Studies minors and majors will successfully conduct and report in writing on at least two structured interviews of at least two women. These interviews will contain specific familial and biographical details, work history, educational history and gender relationship opinions (from the subject). | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Commemoration of the Desegregation of MUW ("Those Who Dared" website attached). Those interviews are now part of MUW's Archives. Both of the students (student 1 and student 2) who graduated in 2016-17 completed an interview of an older woman in WS 200, following the prescribed list of questions in the assignment. (Example attached in documents) | We will continue to collect at least 8 Golden Girl interviews per year, and will make sure that a major or minor is the student intern who trains and monitors the interviewers. |
| | 2.2 (GEO 4.c. & 1.b.) | Students will demonstrate that they can use women's creative works (including but not limited to diaries, letters, journals, body art, clothing, interior design, non-traditional medicinal treatments, and/or culinary arts) to draw conclusions about the roles or statuses of women in a culture or cultures. | Two women's studies faculty members will apply the Value Rubric on Critical Thinking to a sample set of at least six research or analytic essays from at least three upper level women's studies undergraduate courses (excluding papers from WS 400 or WS 499). | A sample set of at least six research or analytic essays from at least three upper level women's studies undergraduate courses (excluding papers from WS 400 or WS 499) will average a score of at least a 3 (upper milestone level) or higher on the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Critical Thinking. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | This year we had eleven papers from a broad range (five different disciplines cross-listed), four of which were written by declared majors or minors. Using the Critical Thinking Value rubric, the average for all 11 was 3.27, which meets the target overall, but two of the students scored below a 3--papers B and H. (see attached rubric table). The target, therefore, was only partially met. The lowest score was a 2, and the highest a 4. Four of the papers | We will continue to collect papers from upper level cross-listed women's studies course, and try to maintain sample set of at least ten papers on which to apply the critical thinking rubric. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|--|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | 2.2 (GEO 4.c. & 1.b.) | Students will demonstrate that they can use women's creative works (including but not limited to diaries, letters, journals, body art, clothing, interior design, non-traditional medicinal treatments, and/or culinary arts) to draw conclusions about the roles or statuses of women in a culture or cultures. | Two women's studies faculty members will apply the Value Rubric on Critical Thinking to a sample set of at least six research or analytic essays from at least three upper level women's studies undergraduate courses (excluding papers from WS 400 or WS 499). | A sample set of at least six research or analytic essays from at least three upper level women's studies undergraduate courses (excluding papers from WS 400 or WS 499) will average a score of at least a 3 (upper milestone level) or higher on the AAC&U VALUE Rubric on Critical Thinking. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | were written by women's studies minors or majors. Their average score overall is impressive--3.7 with the lowest score a 3.2 and the highest, a 4. The non-majors or minors (7 students) total average is 3, and the highest score in this group is a 4 and the lowest a 2. Overall, the non-major and minor scores are impressive, although they do not all meet the upper-milestone level of 3. | We will continue to collect papers from upper level cross-listed women's studies course, and try to maintain sample set of at least ten papers on which to apply the critical thinking rubric. |
| | | | Women's Studies majors and minors will complete a 400 level project using primary biographical or creative sources by/from women. | Women's Studies minors and majors will successfully complete a 400 level project using letters, diaries, interviews, or other primary sources by/from women, and average a score of at least a 3 (upper level milestone level) or higher on the AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Inquiry and Analysis. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Two women's studies students (one a minor and one with a women's studies emphasis in her Interdisciplinary Studies BA) completed projects. Student one transcribed a diary and wrote a historical and biographical introduction. Student two completed interviews and research of primary sources in MUW's archives as a part of MUW's Commemoration of the Fiftieth | We will continue to collect and assess women's studies majors' or minors' WS 400 projects and consider collecting papers or their projects other disciplines (including Honors Projects) when they involve primary sources by women and are done by women's studies majors or minors. We will continue to use the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| | | | Women's Studies majors and minors will complete a 400 level project using primary biographical or creative sources by/from women. | Women's Studies minors and majors will successfully complete a 400 level project using letters, diaries, interviews, or other primary sources by/from women, and average a score of at least a 3 (upper level milestone level) or higher on the AAC&U VALUE Rubric for Inquiry and Analysis. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | Anniversary of the Desegregation of the university: "Those Who Dared." Using the AAC&U Value Rubric for Inquiry and Analysis, Student one scored a 3.2 on her diary transcription project. Student two scored a 4 on her Those Who Dared research and presentation. | We will continue to collect and assess women's studies majors' or minors' WS 400 projects and consider collecting papers or their projects other disciplines (including Honors Projects) when they involve primary sources by women and are done by women's studies majors or minors. We will continue to use the Inquiry and Analysis Value Rubric. |
| | 2.3 (PO 4.d.) | Students will exhibit information literacy and research skills. | A committee of at least three women's studies faculty members will assess all WS 499 final projects using the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Information Literacy. | 100% of students' WS 499 final projects will score at least a 3 or higher (upper milestone level) on the AAC&U VALUE rubric on Information Literacy. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There were no seniors who took WS 400 in 2016-17, but one Interdisciplinary Studies major had women's studies as one of her two emphases and she completed an HO 402 paper whose subject was in women's studies. In IS 499, she earned a 4 in Information Literacy. In HO 402, she also earned a 4 in Information Literacy. | We will continue to collect Capstone and Honors papers and projects from minors in Women's Studies, if those projects have a women's studies emphasis. This will be in addition to the WS 499 Capstone projects. We will apply the Information Literacy Value rubric to these papers/projects. |
| | 3.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will receive a quality women's studies education. | At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the Capstone Survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | 90% of students participating in the Capstone Survey will indicate a "somewhat satisfied" or "very satisfied" satisfaction level reflective of the women's studies curriculum, hands-on learning opportunities and quality of | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There was no formal survey, but we are keeping up with our 4 graduates (one in IS with a women's studies emphasis) via social media, and all said "very satisfied" when asked about their curriculum. The May | We will continue to collect information from our graduates who have completed a major or minor or an emphasis in women's studies. We will also not only survey WS 499 students, but also survey graduates completing degrees in other areas if they also have a minor or a women's studies emphasis. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|--|------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | 3.1 (PO 4.d.) | Students will receive a quality women's studies education. | At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the Capstone Survey results to determine if achievement target was met. | instruction. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | 2016 graduate in Women's Studies has just successfully completed her first year of law school. A May 2017 women's studies minor graduate has already been hired as a nurse. The May 2015 graduate has been accepted to a graduate program in Health Informatics at George Mason University, and will begin in the fall of 2017. The IS student has been accepted into an MFA program at Purdue, and will be starting in the fall of 2017. | We will continue to collect information from our graduates who have completed a major or minor or an emphasis in women's studies. We will also not only survey WS 499 students, but also survey graduates completing degrees in other areas if they also have a minor or a women's studies emphasis. |
| | | | Women's Studies faculty (a group of at least three faculty) who attend the students' Capstone presentations and review the final projects will score the students' work using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics on Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, and Information Literacy. | 100% of all WS Capstone students will average a score of at least a 3 (upper level milestone) or higher on all three AAC&U VALUE rubrics applied to their final projects. An average of the faculty scores will be used to determine the students' final scores. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | We did not have a student finish Capstone this year. There will be two students complete it next year. | We will look forward to analyzing the information collected from the next Alumni survey. |
| | 3.2 (SAO) | Students will be actively engaged using their Women's Studies degrees. | The Alumni Survey is sent out every three years. The next rotation will be in 2019, 2022, and so on. At the end of the | 25% of students participating in the Alumni Survey will state that they are enrolled in a graduate/professional | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | This year was not a year to collect data for an alumni survey, so there is nothing to report from the Office of | We will look forward to analyzing the information collected from the next Alumni survey |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|--|------------------|--------------|---|--|
| | 3.2 (SAO) | Students will be actively engaged using their Women's Studies degrees. | academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | degree program connected with their degree in Women's Studies. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | Institutional Research and Assessment. The next alumni survey will be in 2019. | We will look forward to analyzing the information collected from the next Alumni survey |
| | | | The Alumni Survey is sent out every three years. The next rotation will be in 2019, 2022, and so on. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will review and analyze the results to determine if achievement target was met. | 75% of students participating in the Alumni Survey will state that they are currently working in their field of study or in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the Women's Studies program. | 2016 - 2017 | Inconclusive | This year was not a year to collect data for an alumni survey, so there is nothing to report from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The next alumni survey will be in 2019. | We will look forward to analyzing the information collected from the next Alumni survey. |
| | | | The Departmental Social Media Survey is sent out on the LLP Facebook page every year. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will analyze and compare the survey results to the previous academic year to determine if there was an increase or decrease in employment or graduate enrollment. | 5% increase from the previous academic year of Women's Studies alumni students participating in the Official Departmental Social Media Survey stating that they are either employed in their field of study or in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the Women's Studies program or are enrolled in a graduate/professional program connected with women's studies or women's leadership. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | There was one graduate in 2015, and she indicated high satisfaction with her women's studies degree, and was then working to increase access to health care for poor women in Nepal. The May 2016 graduate in Women's Studies has just successfully completed her first year of law school and is active in campus women's organizations. A May 2017 women's studies minor graduate has already been hired as a nurse, and is interested in | We will continue to use email and social media to stay connected with the women's studies majors and minors who have graduated from MUW. |

| Unit Name | Outcome Name | Outcome | Assessment Method | Achievement Target | Reporting Period | Result Type | Result and Analysis | Action |
|-----------|--------------|---------|---|--|------------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | | The Departmental Social Media Survey is sent out on the LLP Facebook page every year. At the end of the academic year, departmental faculty will analyze and compare the survey results to the previous academic year to determine if there was an increase or decrease in employment or graduate enrollment. | 5% increase from the previous academic year of Women's Studies alumni students participating in the Official Departmental Social Media Survey stating that they are either employed in their field of study or in a field where they regularly use the skills acquired in the Women's Studies program or are enrolled in a graduate/professional program connected with women's studies or women's leadership. | 2016 - 2017 | Target Met | women's geriatrics. The May 2015 graduate has now been accepted to a graduate program in Health Informatics at George Mason University, and will begin in the fall of 2017. She plans to go back to Nepal and work in Women's Public Health. The IS student has been accepted into an MFA program at Purdue, and will be starting in the fall of 2017. She continues to write poetry about women's issues. Since we had one report in 2015-16 and four reports in 2016-17, we are satisfied that our contact with our graduates is increasing by more than five percent. | We will continue to use email and social media to stay connected with the women's studies majors and minors who have graduated from MUW. |