Learning Outcome:

Critical Thinking: Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- 1. Specialized Knowledge
- 2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

ETS Proficiency Profile - Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient

| | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Level 2 Critical Thinking | 70.0% | 78.8% | 73.8% | 79.7% | 66.7% | 64.2% | 28.6% | 68.2% |
| Number of Students | | | | 59 | 45 | 27 | 17 | 22 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

2019-20, the criteria of 70% was not met. However, it was significantly closer this year at 68.2% than in the previous year.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The department has intentionally focused on having our students do more critical thinking in our pedegogy. We started implementing the change in curriculum 2018-19. We are doing more guided group critique and synthesis of case studies to promote deeper critical thinking. Professors are using graphic organizers to help students go deeper in their synthesis of information. We will continue these strategies and keep focused on guiding students in deeper thinking.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

Learning Outcome:

Written: Students will be able to effectively express ideas and information to others through written communication.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

75% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Writing.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- 1. Specialized Knowledge
- 2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

ETS Proficiency Profile - Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient

| | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Level 2 Writing | 80.0% | 72.7% | 71.4% | 84.7% | 75.6% | 67.9% | 57.2% | 54.5% |
| Number of Students | | | | 59 | 45 | 27 | 17 | 22 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

This is the lowest score in Written Communication that our department has had to date. The criterion of 70% was not met.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

A continued focus on writing was implemented throughout all programs from introductory level to mastery level from changes after 2018-19. After program review, a core research course was recommended that will focus on scholarly writing. This research course just started for last years' freshman class. ETS focuses on grammar usage and semantics. The department is evaluating writing separately of the ETS exam for comparison purposes. Scholarly writing is important to the department and we will continue to focus on improving these scores.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

Learning Outcome:

Quantitative Reasoning: Students will be able to solve problems that are quantitative in nature.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Outcome Measure:

ETS Proficiency Profile Exam

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

70% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Math.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- 1. Specialized Knowledge
- 2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

ETS Proficiency Profile - Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient

| | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Level 2 Math | 60.0% | 75.8% | 66.7% | 76.3% | 77.8% | 49.1% | 71.5% | 59.1% |
| Number of Students | | | | 59 | 45 | 27 | 17 | 22 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

This score in quantitative reasoning decreased significantly. The criteria of 70% was not met.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

To continue to focus the practical application of quantitative reasoning throughout the programs. Problem solving scenarios in each field were implemented in Fall 2019. The students who took this test were the first to experience the problem solving scenarios as part of the curriculum. The department will continue to monitor quantitative reasoning throughout the three programs.

Rubric Used

No rubric. We use the ETS Proficiency Profile test results.

Learning Outcome:

Oral Communication: Students will be able to clearly and concisely present the findings of their research in a professional manner.

Outcome Measure:

Annual: Each senior is required to make a formal presentation in front of their peers and the department faculty.

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

80% of the students will be able to make a professional presentation. Students are expected to have at or above an average score of 2.5 on the AAC&U Oral Communication rubric.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- 1. Specialized Knowledge
- 2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

| _ | | Percent at Marginal or Proficient | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--|--|
| | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | | |
| Informational Literacy | | | | | | | Not | | |
| Proficiency Profile | NA | 100% | 100% | 87.5% | 100% | 100% | assessed | | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Not assessed in 2019-20

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this time.

Rubric Used

| Value | <u>.</u> | | Miles | Benchmark | |
|--------------------|------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| | Organization | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation. |
| Oral Communication | Language | Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience. |
| Oral Com | Delivery | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. |
| | Supporting Material | A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation | Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the |

| | significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic. | or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic. | presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/ authority on the topic. |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Central Message | Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported) and applied to the discipline. | Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material and applied to the discipline. | Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable. | Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation. |

Learning Outcome:

Information Literacy: Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand (Information Literacy).

Outcome Measure:

Annual: Each senior is required to write a senior thesis in the Senior Seminar. References: Multiple references from distinct reputable sources

Criteria for Success (how do you judge if the students have met your standards):

80% of the students should be able to develop a strong bibliography scoring a 3 or better on the rubric below.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more but not all five):

- 6. Specialized Knowledge
- 7. Broad Integrative Knowledge
- 8. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
- 9. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
- 10. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

| | Percent at Marginal or Proficient | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--|
| | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 | |
| Informational Literacy | | | | | | | Not | |
| Proficiency Profile | NA | 88.8% | 100% | 75% | 100% | 94% | assessed | |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Not assess in 2019-20.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

No changes have been made at this time. We will closely monitor the outcomes in the future.

Rubric Used

| Information Literacy | Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically | Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering the importance (to the researched topic) of the multiple criteria used (such as relevance to the research question, currency, authority, audience, and bias or point of view). | Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources using multiple criteria (such as relevance to the research question, currency, and authority). | Chooses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance to the research question and currency). | Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance to the research question). |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|