

Assessment and Accreditation Committee

Spring 2020 Committee Recommendations

Biology

English

Speech Pathology and Audiology

BOG Program Review Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

Degree Program: Biology Co-Chair: Joseph Horzempa Assessment Coordinator: Joe Nolan
 Date: March 2020 Committee Action: Assessment Plan Approved
 Next BOG Program Review Spring 2025

Note: If requested by the Chair or Assessment Coordinator, assessment updates may be scheduled in any year preceding the next BOG review.

HEPC Policy: an External Consultant is required for non-accredited programs (recommend by fall 2023).

Biology	Exemplary (5) Full implementation	Completed (4) Implementation/Revisions	Initial (3) Implementation/Revisions	Evidence (2) of Planning	Evidence (1) not Included
Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location. →	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs into program assessment.
Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO. ←	Program has developed/adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones) ←	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years. ←←	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.
← Indicates improvement over last review			→ Indicates a decline over last review		

Assessment Update Recommendations:

The committee would like to commend the continued forward progress you have made in addressing the committee's previous recommendations. Your SLOs are clearly written and measurable and your program has fully integrated the General Studies SLOs. You have developed a plan for assessment and rubrics for that more directly relate to your curriculum. You have clearly thought about your assessment, and we appreciate the complexity of assessing your various majors.

Suggestions: It is the consensus of this committee that you are perhaps working too hard when it comes to completing this assessment report, and we would like to provide some feedback to hopefully save you some time for future reviews.

1. We appreciate your attempt to address our previous recommendations with changes to SLO4. The committee wondered whether SLO4 would be better delineated as two separate outcomes. One outcome pertains to the handling of scientific literature. The second outcome pertains to relating scientific advances to contemporary issues. Separating them may make identifying an assessment measure easier.

BOG Program Review
Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

2. While we recognize you have integrated the General Studies SLOs into your program, we are unclear how SLO1 corresponds to GS SLO2.
3. We also wanted to remind you that it is not necessary that General Studies goals be assessed in every course, only that they be assessed at specific points at the beginning, middle, and end of the program. It may be that in separating the 4th program SLO into two outcomes, the goal can be written to better reflect what you want your students to know and be able to do with regard to Self & Cultural Awareness. For example, is it your hope that students will be able to explain the impact of and relate scientific advances to people and communities of different cultural backgrounds, or to effectively communicate the importance of biological discoveries with sensitivity to various individual and cultural backgrounds, or to explain the clinical applications of scientific discoveries? Once you have determined what it would look like for a biology graduate to meet the self and cultural awareness goal, you can then develop assessments to determine to what extent they are able to demonstrate what they know and can do.
4. We appreciate your efforts to create direct and indirect measures across the curriculum. It is unclear how course evaluations are used to determine the student's performance in relation to the program goals as it is more of the student's assessment of the course than it is the program's assessment of the degree to which students have progressed toward the program goals.
5. One question that was raised with regard to the assessment methods and location of the measures was whether the assessment of program goals was being done at the course or program level.
 - a. This is not a criticism of your assessment as we recognize that there should be a clear alignment between course assessments, course goals, and program goals. Our concern was that you may be creating more work for yourselves than is necessary and thereby adding an unintended burden to an already very busy group of faculty.
 - b. The committee trusts your judgment as to when and how the various components of the program goals will be introduced, reinforced and assessed in courses to help students to ultimately reach the program goals. We were intending to suggest that it may not be necessary to collate so much information at the beginning and middle of the program.
 - c. For purposes of this review, the committee is interested in the assessment strategies developed to determine to what extent students have met the program goals, at what points across the program you are checking their progress, how you plan to collect and analyze the data, and what changes have been made as a result of your analysis, and where in the program you are assessing general studies SLOs?
 - d. We also recognize the value of student feedback on the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the program, however, this is not necessary to report for this review, which is focused on your aggregate assessment of student's level of progress toward the program goal and not the student's satisfaction with or assessment of the program. It appears that the capstone project may be a better measure of student outcomes, while the focus group may be a better assessment of student's perceptions of the program which, while valuable for biology faculty, is beyond the scope of this committee.

BOG Program Review
Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

- e. Since we do not have a copy of the exit survey, we just wanted to remind you that the survey should include information related to the achievement of the SLOs. A satisfaction survey or feedback about the program alone is insufficient to determine the extent to which the goals were met.
- f. While you may use your rubric for purposes of grading individual student's assignments in each class, it is only necessary to tabulate your overall program data at set points near the beginning, middle, and end of the program and report the aggregate data. It is sufficient to simply report aggregate data from BIO 124/125, 306, and the capstone for instance. The other course may also have assessments that are designed as scaffolding to help students reach the overall program goals, but you are not expected to compile aggregate data for each of those courses. Three data points are sufficient (beginning, middle, and end).
- g. To aid the committee, we would appreciate it if you would submit the appropriate template in Livetext. If you need assistance with LiveText, please contact Sarah West at sarah.west@westliberty.edu

BOG Program Review Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

Degree Program: English Chair: Angela Rehbein Assessment Coordinator: Amanda Tennant

Date: March 2020 Committee Action: Assessment Plan Approved

Next BOG Program Review Spring 2025

Note: If requested by the Chair or Assessment Coordinator, assessment updates may be scheduled in any year preceding the next BOG review.

HEPC Policy: an External Consultant is required for non-accredited programs (recommend by fall 2023).

English	Exemplary (5) Full implementation	Completed (4) Implementation/Revisions	Initial (3) Implementation/Revisions	Evidence (2) of Planning	Evidence (1) not Included
Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable. ←←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs into program assessment.
Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO. ←←	Program has developed/adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones)	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program. ←	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas. ←←	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year.	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data. ←	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.
← Indicates improvement over last review			→ Indicates a decline over last review		

Assessment Update Recommendations:

The committee would like to commend the continued forward progress you have made in addressing the committee's previous recommendations. Your SLOs are clearly written and measurable and your program has fully integrated the General Studies SLOs. You have developed a plan for assessment and rubrics that more directly relate to your curriculum.

1. You have clearly communicated the relationship between your program goals and the general studies SLOs. The committee trusts your judgment as to when and how the various components of the program goals will be introduced and reinforced to help students to ultimately reach the program goals, and this is not necessary for you to report. For purposes of this review, the committee is interested in the assessment strategies developed to determine to what extent students have met the program goals, at what points across the program you are checking their progress, how you plan to collect and analyze the data, and what changes have been made as a result of your analysis. and where in the program you are assessing general studies SLOs.

BOG Program Review
Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

2. You have started to develop rubrics for the SLOs in your program, and we would like to encourage you to continue to refine them by differentiating the categories (underdeveloped, developed, proficient, and exceptional). We would like to remind you that while you may use your rubric for purposes of grading individual student's assignments in each class, it is only necessary to tabulate your overall program data at set points near the beginning, middle, and end of the program and report the aggregate data. The assessment coordinator may want to meet with Sarah West and request that she add the rubrics to the courses. Sarah can set this up for the faculty each semester, which may aid in aggregating the data.
3. The program has started collecting data from an exit survey. Since we do not have a copy of the exit survey, we just wanted to remind you that the survey should include information related to the achievement of the SLOs. A satisfaction survey or feedback about the program alone is insufficient to determine the extent to which the goals were met.
4. The committee recommends that you develop a plan for disseminating the collected data and encouraging faculty engagement in 2020-2021 rather than waiting until year three. Identifying specific strategies for using the data for continuous program improvement will be possible once you begin to notice trends in your data, and we are looking forward to seeing your progress at the next review.

BOG Program Review
Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

Degree Program: Speech Pathology and Audiology Director: Stephanie Bradley Date: March 2020
 Committee Action: Assessment Plan Approved Next BOG Program Review **Spring 2025**

Note: If requested by the Program Director, assessment updates may be scheduled in any year preceding the next BOG review.

HEPC Policy: an **External Consultant** is required for non-accredited programs (**recommend by fall 2023**).

SPA	Exemplary (5) Full implementation	Completed (4) Implementation/Revisions	Initial (3) Implementation/Revisions	Evidence (2) of Planning	Evidence (1) not Included
Student Learning Outcomes	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs that are clearly and specifically stated.	Program has developed at least 3 SLOs, but they show some lack in clarity or specificity.	Program has stated some SLOs, but they are far too vague and/or immeasurable to be useful.	Program has not solidified SLOs and may still be in the planning/discussion stages.	No indication that the program has considered or even begun drafting SLOs
General Studies Integration	Program has fully integrated General Studies SLOs into its assessment plan (both in its SLOs and measures) where applicable. ←←	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan (SLOs and measures) in at least one location.	Program has integrated at least one applicable General Studies SLO into its assessment plan in <i>either</i> an SLO or measure.	Program demonstrates the recognition of a need to integrate General Studies SLOs into program assessment, but is still planning for implementation.	Program shows no indication of attempting to integrate General Studies SLOs into program assessment.
Assessment Method (Measures/ Instruments)	Program has developed/adopted multiple assessment measures (both direct and indirect) for each stated SLO. ←	Program has developed/adopted at least one assessment measure (direct or indirect) for each stated SLO.	Program has developed/adopted at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO.	Program is in the process of developing assessment measures for at least one SLO	Program has not considered a method for measuring its SLOs.
Location of Measures	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for each SLO at multiple points throughout the program (milestones and capstones) ←←	Program has implemented multiple assessment measures for at least one SLO at multiple points throughout the program.	Program has implemented at least one assessment measure for at least one SLO in at least one location in the program.	Program is still developing measures and is, therefore, still considering appropriate locations for those measures.	No consideration given to the location of assessment measures.
Timeline for Assessment Implementation	Program has outlined a clear plan for assessment implementation over each of the next 3 years.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation over the next three years, but that plan has some incomplete areas.	Program has articulated a plan for assessment implementation, but that plan does not extend beyond the upcoming year. →→	Program shows evidence of having thought about future assessment implementation, but those plans are not clearly or systematically articulated.	Program shows no evidence of having thought about assessment implementation in the upcoming years
Implementation of Program Revision	Program clearly shows how assessment findings have been used in recent program revisions, and has identified a plan for further program improvement.	Program has shown evidence of having linked assessment findings to program improvement, but has not yet completed those improvements, and the program may have a plan for doing so in upcoming years.	Program has not sufficiently shown the link between program revisions and assessment findings. Program may have an incomplete plan for future improvements based on current data.	Program has identified a generalized plan for future program improvement based on assessment findings currently being gathered.	Program shows no evidence of using assessment findings for program improvement.
← Indicates improvement over last review			→ Indicates a decline over last review		

Assessment Update Recommendations:

The committee would like to applaud the considerable thought which is evident in your first official program review. You have identified student learning outcomes which are measurable and clearly stated. Your program has fully integrated the General Studies SLOs into your assessment plan. You have developed a plan to evaluate student progress toward obtaining the program SLOs using both direct and indirect measures across the program.

With an eye toward that future review, we would like to make some suggestions to aid your progress

1. The committee recognizes that you are in the earliest stages of developing your assessment program. We look forward to seeing the instruments that you develop to assess your program SLOs, the data you have collected, and the programmatic changes which are made or proposed as a result of your data analysis at the next review.
 - a. Including your assessments instruments, rubrics, and analysis of student performance

BOG Program Review
Assessment and Accreditation Committee Recommendations

- b. Provide a narrative of how the assessment data is communicated with faculty in your program and the steps you are taking or plan to take to improve identified areas of weakness.
- c. As you develop these measures, remember that these assessments, particularly the exit interview questions, needs to be more than just program satisfaction. All methods should be assessing the extent to which students are able to achieve your learning outcomes.
 - i. As a reminder, it is important to ensure that you are measuring each SLO. While graduate school acceptance and percentage employed provide you with valuable information, they are indirect measures of whether a student is able to meet the objectives.
 - ii. Since we do not have a copy of the exit survey, we just wanted to remind you that the survey should include information related to the achievement of the SLOs. A satisfaction survey or feedback about the program alone is insufficient to determine the extent to which the goals were met.
2. We would like to remind you that your timeline is focused on the next three years (from the date of the review) rather than the past three years.
3. The current actions should relate to what you are doing to further develop your assessment methodology, reinforce areas of identified strengths, respond to identified challenges and weaknesses with regard to student's successful attainment of the program's SLOs.
4. To aid the committee, we would appreciate it if you would submit the appropriate template in Livetext. If you need assistance with LiveText, please contact Sarah West at sarah.west@westliberty.edu

Continue with the work you have begun, and we look forward to your ongoing process of programmatic assessment.