

CWU - SUMMARY OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING REPORTS BY COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT, AND PROGRAM 2012/2013

Elements of Student Learning Outcomes assessed:

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?
2. How were they assessed?
3. What was learned (assessment results)?
4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information (feedback/program improvement)?
5. How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year's assessment?

College of Arts and Humanities - CAH

	Dept./Program	Degree Program	Report Submitted	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improve.	Previous Year Use
1.	Art	BFA-Art	X	3	3	4	2	1
2.		BA-Art	X	3	3	4	2	1
3.	<i>On Reserve</i>	BA-Visual Arts Teaching	X	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4
4.	<i>On Reserve</i>	MA-Art	X	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4
5.		MFA-Art	X	2	3	2	2	2
6.	Asia/Pacific Studies Program	BA-Asia/Pacific Studies	X	3	3	4	2	2
7.	Communication	BA-Communication Studies	X	3	1	4	1	1
8.		BA-Public Relations	X	3	1	1	2	2
9.		BA-Journalism	X	3	1	1	2	2
10.		BA-Film & Video Studies	X	4	3	4	2	2
11.	English	BA-English Language and Literature	X	3	4	4	2	2
12.		BA-English Language Arts Teaching	CTL	3	4	4	NA	NA
13.		MA-English Literature	X	3	0	4	2	0
14.		MA-TESOL	X	3	0	4	2	1
15.	World Languages	BA - Russian	X	2	3	4	2	1
16.		BA - Russian Teaching	CTL	3	4	4	NA8	NA8
17.		BA - French	X	2	3	4	2	1
18.		BA - French Teaching	CTL	3	4	4	NA8	NA8
19.		BA - Japanese	X	2	3	4	2	1
20.		BA - Japanese Teaching	CTL	3	4	4	NA8	NA8
21.		BA- Spanish	X	2	3	4	2	1
22.		BA-Spanish Teaching	CTL	3	4	4	NA8	NA8
23.	History	BA-History	X	4	3	4	2	2
24.		BA-History: Social Studies Teaching	CTL	3	4	4	NA	NA
25.		MA - History	X	2	3	4	2	2
26.	Music	BM-Music Composition	X	4	3	4	2	2
27.		BM- Music Vocal Performance	X	4	3	4	2	2
28.		BM-Keyboards Performance	X	4	3	4	2	2
29.		BM - Percussion, Wind, String Perf.	X	4	3	4	2	2
30.		BM-Music Education	CTL	4	4	4	2	2
31.		BA-Music	X	4	3	4	2	2
32.		MM- Music	X	4	4	4	2	2
33.	Philosophy & Rel. Studies	BA-Philosophy	X	4	3	4	2	2
34.	Theatre Arts	BA-Theatre Arts - General Studies	X	4	0	0	0	2
35.		BFA-Theatre Arts	X	4	0	0	0	2
36.	<i>On reserve</i>	BA-Theatre Arts: Teaching K-12	X	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4
37.		MA - Theatre Arts	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
AVERAGE CAH RATINGS			37	3.2	2.7	3.5	1.8	1.6

College of Arts & Humanities

NA = Not Applicable	NA1 = Revised Plan
NA2 = Program Under Suspension	NA3 = <5 Students in Program
NA4 = Program Under Review	NA5 = Annual Report - No SLO
NA6 = Assess. Plan being Revised	NA7 = No Report Submitted
NA8 = Program just formed	NA9 = report reflects GenEd evaluation

	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improve.	Previous Year Use
2012/2013	3.2	2.7	3.5	1.8	1.6
2011/2012	2.5	2.8	3.3	1.9	1.7
2010/2011	2.1	2.4	2.6	1.5	1.7
2009/2010	2.4	2.3	2.4	1.3	1.8
2008/2009	2.6	2.1	2.5	0.9	1.6
2007/2008	2.4	1.7	2.8	0.8	1.3
TARGET	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 2	2 / 2
2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08

Total UG Programs	30	26	26	26	25	27
Total Grad Programs	7	7	7	7	7	7
Non-Reporting (UG)	0	0	0	0	3	4
Non-Reporting (GR)	0	0	0	0	3	5
% Reporting (UG)	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%	85%
% Reporting (GR)	100%	100%	100%	100%	57%	24%
% Reporting (Total)	100%	100%	100%	100%	81%	74%

Comments:

- 100% of CAH programs have submitted annual assessment reports each of the last four years. The entire college is commended for its culture of assessment and improvement.
- CAH's overall average score has improved on two elements of the rubric. CAH is well above target for outcomes assessed, assessment methods, and results.
- Rubric elements 4 and 5 are close to the maximum possible score but they both decreased a bit during the 2012/13. Please focus on those areas during the 2013/14 academic year.
- More CAH programs reported how many students were assessed. Hopefully all programs will include that data in the 2013/14 report.
- The M.M. Music is commended for their excellent work/report.

College of Education and Professional Studies - CEPS

	Dept./Program	Degree Program	Report Submitted	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improv.	Previous Year Use
1.	Advanced Programs	M.Ed. School Administration	X	4	4	4	1	1
2.		M.Ed Instructional Leadership	X	4	4	4	1	1
3.		M.Ed. Higher Education	X	2	2	2	1	NA
4.	Aviation	BS-Aviation Management	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
5.		BS Professional Pilot	X	4	4	4	1	1
6.	EFC	M.Ed.-Master Teacher	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
7.	Family Consumer Sciences	BS-Family Studies	X	2	1	2	2	0
8.		BA-Family & Consumer Sciences	CTL	4	3	4	NA	NA
9.		BS-FCS, Career & Tech. Ed. Teaching	CTL	4	3	4	NA	NA
10.		BS -Apparel, Textiles and Merchandising	X	2	4	4	1	2
11.		BS-Recreation and Tourism	X	4	3	4	1	2
12.		BS-Global Wine Studies	X	4	3	4	2	2
13.		MS-Family & Consumer Sciences	X	2	1	1	1	NA
14.	Engineering Technologies,	BS-Construction Management	X	4	4	4	2	2
15.	Safety & Construction	BS-Electronic Engineering Technology	X	4	1	2	2	2
16.		BS-Industrial Technology	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
17.		BAS-Industrial Technology	X	NA2	NA2	NA2	NA2	NA2
18.		BS-Mechanical Engineering Tech.	X	4	2	4	2	2
19.		BS-Technology Education	CTL	4	3	4	1	1
20.		BS-Safety and Health Management	X	2	1	3	1	2
21.		MS-Engineering Technology	X	2	1	3	1	2
22.	ITAM	BS-Information Technology & Administrative Management	X	2	3	4	NA	2
23.		BAS-Information Technology & Administrative Management	X	2	3	4	NA	2
24.	LLSE	BA Ed.-Special Education	CTL	4	3	4	1	1
25.		M.Ed. Literacy	X	4	2	0	1	NA8
26.		M.Ed.-Special Education	X	NA10	NA10	NA10	NA10	NA10
27.	NEHS	BS-Exercise Science	X	2	3	4	1	2
28.		BS-Paramedicine	X	2	2	2	1	2
29.		BS-Food Science & Nutrition	X	2	4	4	NA	2
30.		BS - Clinical Physiology	X	4	0	4	NA	0
31.		MS-Exercise Science	X	2	3	4	NA	1
32.		MS-Nutrition	X	2	1	2	1	0
33.	TEACH	BA Ed.-Early Childhood Education	CTL+	4	3	4	2	0
34.		BA Ed.-Elementary Education	CTL+	4	3	4	2	1
35.	PESPH	BS-Physical Education & School Health	X	4	3	4	2	1
36.		BS-Public Health	X	2	3	4	2	2
37.		MS-Health and Physical Education	X	2	3	4	1	2
AVERAGE CEPS RATINGS			37	3.1	2.6	3.4	1.4	1.5

College of Education and Professional Studies - CEPS

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| NA = Not Applicable | NA1 = Revised Plan |
| NA2 = Program Under Suspension | NA3 = <5 Students in Program |
| NA4 = Program Under Review | NA5 = Annual Report - No SLO |
| NA6 = Assess. Plan being Revised | NA7 = No Report Submitted |
| NA8 = Program just formed | NA9 = report reflects GenEd evaluation |

NA10 = Less than 10 students in CTL graduate program

	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improv.	Previous Year Use
2012/2013	3.1	2.6	3.4	1.4	1.5
2011/2012	3.0	2.9	3.4	1.5	1.4
2010/2011	2.7	3.0	3.2	1.7	1.6
2009/2010	3.4	2.6	3.1	1.4	1.5
2008/2009	3.0	2.4	3.1	1.2	1.5
2007/2008	3.2	1.8	2.4	1.0	1.7
TARGET	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 2	2 / 2

	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
Total UG Programs	26	26	26	26	27	26
Total Grad Programs	11	9	9	9	9	8
Non-Reporting (UG)	0	0	0	5	4	6
Non-Reporting (GR)	0	0	0	4	3	5
% Reporting (UG)	100%	100%	100%	81%	85%	77%
% Reporting (GR)	100%	100%	100%	56%	66%	38%
% Reporting (Total)	100%	100%	100%	74%	81%	68%

Comments:

- 100% of CEPS programs have submitted annual assessment reports each of the last three years. The entire college is commended for its culture of assessment and improvement.
- This is the second year that CTL reports were used for some degree programs.
Note: CTL reports combine data required by the Washington State Professional Educators Standard Board in addition to Annual Assessment Report.
- The average college-wide rubric score has improved slightly for three of the elements measured. There was a fairly large drop in #2 "Methods of Assessment."
- Two important rubric elements are below target and need improving: (4) "What will the department/program do as a result of the information" and (5) "How did the department/program use the feedback from last year's assessment?" Perhaps these elements could be added to CTL reports?
- The college did a much better job of reporting the number of students assessed.
- The B.S. Construction Management program is commended for their excellent work/report.

College of the Sciences - COTS

	Dept.	Program	Report Submitted	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improv.	Previous Year Use
1.	Anthropology	BA-Anthropology	X	4	4	4	2	2
2.		BS-Anthropology	X	4	4	4	2	2
3.	Biological Sciences	BA-Biology	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
4.		BS-Biology	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
5.		BS-Biology Teaching	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
6.		MS-Biology	X	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6	NA6
7.	Chemistry	BA-Chemistry: Teaching	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
8.		BS-Chemistry	X	2	3	4	2	1
9.		MS-Chemistry	X	2	3	4	2	2
10.	Computer Science	BS-Computer Science	X	4	2	4	2	2
11.		MS-Computational Sciences	X	2	2	4	2	NA8
12.	Environ. Studies	BS-Environmental Studies	X	2	3	4	2	1
13.	Geography	BA-Geography	X	2	3	4	1	2
14.	Geological Sciences	BS-Geology	X	2	3	3	2	1
15.		BA-Geology	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
16.		BS-Environmental Geological Sciences	X	2	3	3	2	1
17.	<i>under internal review</i>	BA-Earth Science Teaching	X	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4
18.		MS-Geological Sciences	X	2	3	3	2	1
19.	Law and Justice	BA-Law and Justice	X	4	3	3	2	1
20.		MS-Law and Justice	X	NA8	NA8	NA8	NA8	NA8
21.	Mathematics	BS-Mathematics	X	2	3	4	1	1
22.		BS -Actuarial Science	X	2	0	3	1	1
23.		BA-Mathematics: Teaching Secondary	CTL	2	3	3	NA CTL	NA CTL
24.	<i>under internal review</i>	BA -Middle Level Mathematics and Science Teaching	X	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4
25.	<i>under internal review</i>	MA-Teachers, Mathematics	X	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4	NA4
26.	Physics	BA-Physics	X	4	3	4	2	1
27.		BS-Physics	X	4	3	4	2	1
28.	Political Science	BA-Political Science	X	4	3	4	2	2

29.	<i>On Reserve</i>	<i>BS-Public Policy</i>	X	NA2	NA2	NA2	NA2	NA2
30.	Primate Behavior	BS-Primate Behavior and Ecology	X	2	3	2	2	2
31.		MS-Primate Behavior	X	2	3	2	1	2
32.	Psychology	BA-Psychology	X	4	3	4	2	2
33.		MS-Experimental Psychology	X	4	3	4	2	2
34.		MS-Mental Health Counseling	X	4	4	4	2	2
35.		EdS School Psychology	X	2	3	4	2	2
36.	Resource Management	MS-Resource Management	X	2	3	4	2	2
37.	Science Education	BS-General Science Teaching	X	2	3	4	1	2
38.	Sociology	BA-Sociology	X	4	3	4	2	1
39.		BS-Social Services	X	4	3	4	2	1
AVERAGE COTS RATINGS			39	2.9	2.9	3.6	1.8	1.5
				2.5	3.1	4.0	1.7	1.8

College of the Sciences - COTS

NA = Not Applicable	NA1 = Revised Plan
NA2 = Program Under Suspension	NA3 = <5 Students in Program
NA4 = Program Under Review	NA5 = Annual Report - No SLO
NA6 = Assess. Plan being Revised	NA7 = No Report Submitted
NA8 = Program just formed	NA9 = report reflects GenEd evaluation
NA10 = Less than 10 students in CTL graduate program	

	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improv.	Previous Year Use
2012/2013	2.9	2.9	3.6	1.8	1.5
2011/2012	2.5	3.1	4.0	1.7	1.8
2010/2011	2.7	2.9	3.6	1.8	1.9
2009/2010	2.7	2.5	3.0	1.6	1.8
2008/2009	2.6	2.3	2.9	1.5	1.8
2007/2008	2.8	2.6	3.2	1.6	1.9
TARGET	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 2	2 / 2

	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
Total UG Programs	28	28	28	28	29	27
Total Grad Programs	11	12	12	10	10	9
Non-Reporting (UG)	0	0	0	1	1	3
Non-Reporting (GR)	0	0	0	1	2	3
% Reporting (UG)	100%	100%	100%	96%	97%	89%
% Reporting (GR)	100%	100%	100%	90%	80%	67%
% Reporting (Total)	100%	100%	100%	95%	92%	84%

Comments:

- 100% of COTS programs submitted annual assessment reports each of the last three years. The entire college is commended for its culture of assessment and improvement.
- The average rubric score for rubric elements #1 "What student learning outcomes were assessed this year and why?" and #4 "What will the department or program do as a result of that information" both improved over the prior year.
- The average rating of Element #2 "How were they assessed?" dropped just a bit.
- The average rating of Element #3 "What was learned" dropped during 2012/13 but it is still above target
- We recommend that COTS focus improvement on rubric element #5 "How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year's assessment?"
- Three programs deserves recognition for excellent assessment of student learning outcomes during the 2012/13 academic year:
 - ▶ B.A. Anthropology
 - ▶ B.S. Anthropology
 - ▶ M.S. Mental Health Counseling

College of Business - CB

	Dept./Program	Degree Program	Report Submitted	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improve.	Previous Year Use
1.	Accounting	BS-Accounting	X	2	3	3	2	2
2.		MPA-Professional Accountancy	X	2	3	4	2	1
3.	Economics	BS-Economics	X	3	4	4	2	2
4.	Finance & Supply Chain Mgt.	BS-Business Administration	X	2	3	4	2	1
5.	Management	BS-Business Administration	X	2	3	4	2	1
AVERAGE CB RATINGS			5	2.2	3.2	3.8	2.0	1.4

College of Business - CB

NA = Not Applicable	NA1 = Revised Plan
NA2 = Program Under Suspension	NA3 = <5 Students in Program
NA4 = Program Under Review	NA5 = Annual Report - No SLO

NA6 = Assess. Plan being Revised
 NA8 = Program just formed

NA7 = No Report Submitted
 NA9 = report reflects GenEd evaluation

	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improve.	Previous Year Use
2012/2013	2.2	3.2	3.8	2.0	1.4
2011/2012	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0
2010/2011	2.3	1.0	1.8	1.3	1.0
2009/2010	1.5	2.3	2.8	1.0	1.5
2008/2009	2.5	2.3	3.0	0.8	1.5
2007/2008	2.7	2.3	2.7	1.0	1.0
TARGET	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 2	2 / 2

	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
Total UG Programs	4	3	3	3	3	3
Total Grad Programs	1	1	1	1	1	1
Non-Reporting (UG)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Non-Reporting (GR)	0	0	0	0	0	0
% Reporting (UG)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	66%
% Reporting (GR)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Reporting (Total)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%

Comments:

- All College of Business programs submitted ASL reports for the fifth consecutive year.
- The entire college and all programs are commended for their culture of assessment and improvement and their excellent results.
- The average ratings dropped for two of the five elements measured:
 Element #1: What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?
 Element #5: How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year's assessment?
 The College should focus on improving both of those areas during 2013/14.
- We recommend that the College of Business also report on some of their indirect assessments and some of their assessments of skills and attitudes/dispositions in addition to the Major Field Tests which are direct assessments of knowledge.

Other

	Dept.	Program	Report Evaluated	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improve.	Previous Year Use
1.	Individual Studies	BA-Individual Studies	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
2.		BS-Individual Studies	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
3.		BM-Individual Studies	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
4.		MA-Individual Studies	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
5.		M.Ed.-Individual Studies	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
6.		MS-Individual Studies	X	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3	NA3
7.		BA-Interdiscip. Stud-Social Sciences	X	4	3	4	2	2
AVERAGE RATINGS FOR IS/IDS PROGRAM			7	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0

INDIVIDUAL / INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

NA = Not Applicable
 NA2 = Program Under Suspension
 NA4 = Program Under Review
 NA6 = Assess. Plan being Revised
 NA8 = Program just formed
 NA1 = Revised Plan
 NA3 = <5 Students in Program
 NA5 = Annual Report - No SLO
 NA7 = No Report Submitted
 NA9 = report reflects GenEd evaluation

	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improv.	Previous Year Use
2012/2013	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
2011/2012	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
2010/2011	3.7	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
2009/2010	3.8	2.8	3.5	1.3	2.0
2008/2009	3.5	3.0	4.0	1.0	1.8
2007/2008	2.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	NA
TARGET	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 2	2 / 2

	2012/13	2011/12	2010-11	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08
Total UG Programs	4	4	4	4	4	4
Total Grad Programs	3	3	3	3	3	3
Non-Reporting (UG)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Reporting (GR)	0	0	0	0	0	3
% Reporting (UG)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Reporting (GR)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%

% Reporting (Total)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	57%
---------------------	------	------	------	------	------	-----

Comment:

The BA-Interdiscip. Stud-Social Sciences is commended for excellent assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes during the 2012/13 academic year and for submitting a report for each of the last six years.

125 CWU SUMMARY OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORTS FOR 2010/2011

	Outcomes	Methods	Results	Feedback / Program Improv.	Previous Year Use
2012/13	3.1	2.9	3.7	1.8	1.6
2011/12	2.7	2.9	3.6	1.7	1.6
2010/11	2.5	2.7	3.2	1.7	1.6
2009/10	2.7	2.5	3.0	1.3	1.7
2008/09	2.8	2.4	3.1	1.1	1.5
2007/08	2.6	2.3	3.0	1.1	1.5
TARGET	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 4	2 / 2	2 / 2

	2012/13	2011/12	2010/11	2009/10	2008/09	2007/08
Total undergraduate programs	92	87	87	87	88	87
Total graduate programs	33	32	32	30	30	28
Total degree programs	125	119	119	117	118	115
Undergraduate programs reporting	92	87	87	81	80	75
Graduate programs reporting	33	32	32	25	22	11
Total programs reporting	125	119	119	106	102	86
Non-reporting - undergraduate	0	0	0	6	8	12
Non-reporting - graduate	0	0	0	5	8	17
Total non-reporting	0	0	0	11	16	29
% Reporting - undergraduate	100%	100%	100%	93%	91%	87%
% Reporting - graduate	100%	100%	100%	83%	73%	40%
% Reporting - total	100%	100%	100%	91%	86%	75%

Comments:

- All of CWU's degree programs submitted ASL reports for the third consecutive year.
- CWU improved its average rating of three rubric elements: Outcomes, Results, and Feedback/Program Improvement.
- The average ratings of Methods and Previous Year Use held steady.
- CWU should consider raising the target on the first three elements of the ASL reports. The institution has always met targets.
- During 2013-2014 programs should focus on improving element 4: "What will the department/program do as a result of that information (feedback/program improvement)?" and element 5: "How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year's assessment?"