

Cornerstone University
Annual Assessment Report: 2015-2016

Table of Contents

Assessment Activities: 2015-2016.....	3
Context.....	3
Goals.....	3
Outcomes.....	3
Work Plan for 2016-2017.....	6
Goals.....	6
Strategies.....	6
Appendices.....	8
Appendix A: Traditional Undergraduate College - Annual Reports by Division.....	8
<i>Business Division</i>	8
<i>Communications and Media Division</i>	11
<i>Humanities Division</i>	14
<i>Kinesiology, Science and Math Division</i>	16
<i>Music Division</i>	24
<i>Social Sciences Division</i>	26
<i>Teacher Education Division</i>	30
Appendix B: Professional and Graduate Studies – Annual Report.....	36
<i>PGS Curricular Learning Outcome Review</i>	36
<i>Program Review</i>	44
<i>Review of Individual Courses</i>	48
Appendix C: Grand Rapids Theological Seminary – Annual Report.....	53

Assessment Committee Activities: 2015-2016

Context

The 2015-2016 academic year has been one of significant transition. In the summer of 2015, Cornerstone University's academic leadership structure shifted in order to facilitate more university-wide collaboration among the various principal academic units (PAUs). With a new emphasis on cross-unit collaboration, it became clear that the best way to facilitate and organize the work of assessment moving forward would be to establish a set of shared learning outcomes that would unify the distinct PAUs, which include the Traditional Undergraduate college (TUG), Professional and Graduate Studies (PGS), Grand Rapids Theological Seminary (GRTS) and Asia Bible Theological Seminary (ABTS). These shared outcomes would ensure a more consistent, manageable system of assessment and would allow each PAU to leverage each others' expertise.

Goals

The Assessment Committee established the following goals for assessment during the 2015-2016 academic year:

- 1. Identify where each academic degree program (i.e. major, core curriculum, etc.) is currently at in terms of their assessment plan.**
- 2. Initiate the development of new institutional learning domains (ILDs).**
- 3. Increase faculty competency in the area of assessment of student learning.**
- 4. Map out a clear path for assessment work moving forward.**

Outcomes

Goal #1: In order to figure out the best path forward, the Assessment Committee determined that it was essential to gain a clearer picture of where each of our 80+ academic programs currently stand in regards to their plans for the assessment of student learning within their respective program. The assessment plan refers to the following components:

- Program mission or purpose statement
- Student learning outcomes at the program-level (PLOs)
- Curriculum correlation matrixes/connections to the PLOs
- Artifacts (signature assessments) that tie back to the PLOs

The current status of each PAU is as follows:

- GRTS: All degree programs have each of the components outlined above.
- PGS: All degree programs have four shared learning outcomes, but not a complete PLO map.

- TUG: Some programs have identified some of the components, but most did not. Most of the PLO maps lack at least one of the components listed above and/or lack specificity. The core curriculum – which is considered its own “program” – has 32 educational goals. Most of these educational goals are unmeasurable, and none of them have clearly identified artifacts tying back to each one.

Goal #2: Concurrently, the Assessment Committee began to work on identifying the common learning domains that would serve two important purposes: 1) to define the essential characteristics of a CU degree, and 2) direct the work of assessment across campus moving forward.

Drawing from the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), a learning-centered framework developed by Lumina Foundation, the CU Assessment Committee voted and approved five new institutional learning domains and suggested outcomes in April 2016:

I. Specialized Knowledge

Cornerstone students will demonstrate knowledge of and proficiency in the terminology, theories, concepts, practices, and skills specific to their field of study.

II. Applied Knowledge and Collaborative Learning

Cornerstone students will exhibit competency in applying their knowledge to address real-life problems through both individual and group effort.

III. Broad and Integrative Knowledge

Cornerstone students will demonstrate their ability to integrate relevant areas of knowledge from multiple fields of study (e.g., the humanities, arts, theology, sciences and social sciences).

IV. Civic & Global Engagement

Cornerstone students will demonstrate intercultural competence in addressing civic, social, environmental and economic issues.

V. Biblical Worldview Integration and Action.

Cornerstone students will be able to articulate a Christ-centered worldview and its personal, professional, and communal embodiment through Christian virtues.

Goal #3: The key to long-term success for student learning assessment work at Cornerstone is a well-informed and engaged faculty. As the experts within each degree program, they are the best-equipped individuals to identify desired learning outcomes, assess their success, and enact needed change for improvement. Throughout the academic year, the following events or activities were conducted for the purpose of building faculty capacity in student learning assessment:

- One-on-one meetings with the division chairs and/or program leaders
- Meeting in January with all core core course coordinators
- Assessment workshops during the Spring Faculty Work Day

Additionally, the Associate Dean of Assessment and Student Success began requiring that any proposal for a new program at UAC or Faculty senate must include a completed PLO map. Similarly, this template was used to guide the development of other co-curricular programs, such as the new Life Path advising

program that will be implemented through the Center for Student Success. Integrating this document into current processes further emphasizes the importance of identifying clear program outcomes right at the beginning that will then inform the development of the program itself.

Goal #4: Establishing a clear plan for assessment work moving forward will help the university as a whole stay on task and ensure achievement of its goals. Key representatives from each PAU met together to develop a framework for the university's first-ever university-wide assessment plan for student learning. This new plan outlines the key philosophies, structures, and calendars for assessment work.

Work Plan for 2016-2017

Goals

The goals and timeline for assessment at Cornerstone during the next academic year are included below:

Fall term (Deadline: December 20)

1. Establish measureable program learning outcomes (PLOs) for every program
2. Review and approve institutional learning domains (ILDs)
3. Create or revise and approve an Alumni Survey template to be used in each PAU

Spring term (Deadline: May 30)

4. Establish and approve measureable program learning outcomes (PLOs) for the core
5. Approve a university-wide Program Review template and schedule
6. Complete curricular mapping of PLOs for every program in each PAU
7. Submit annual division assessment reports to Assessment Office

Summer term (Deadline: August 15)

8. Add ILDs and PLOs to website
9. Add ILDs and PLOs to 2018-2019 academic catalog
10. Submit university-wide annual assessment report to leadership

Strategies

The following list outlines an overview of the primary strategies that will be employed to accomplish the aforementioned goals:

University-wide Strategies

- **Conduct faculty focus groups to gain feedback on the proposed institutional learning outcomes (ILOs).** In late August/early September, the Associate Dean of Assessment and Student Success will coordinate sessions whose primary purpose will be to field input and answer questions regarding the institutional learning outcomes approved by the Assessment Committee.
- **Coordinate with key administrative assistants to publish ILDs and PLOs to the university website.** After the ILOs and PLOs have been approved through the appropriate channels, the Associate Dean of Assessment and Student Success will work closely with the marketing team and the administrative assistants within each division to ensure that they are posted on CU's external website.
- **Participate in assessment-related conferences and educational workshops.** The Associate Dean of Assessment and Student Success and other CU assessment champions will identify key professional development opportunities – such as the Assessment Institute in Indianapolis – to

continue to deepen their understanding of current best practices and trends in assessment of student learning in higher education.

TUG-Specific Strategies

- ***Train and deploy faculty assessment coaches to help program leaders establish program learning outcomes (PLOs).*** Two faculty assessment coaches have been hired for the upcoming year to work closely with all program faculty leaders to develop and/or refine their PLOs. One-on-one instruction will ensure that each faculty member understands the new assessment system, how the PLOs fit into the overall ILOs, and how to conduct meaningful assessment projects moving forward. These assessment coaches will meet regularly with the Associate Dean of Assessment and Student Success to ensure that the information being communicated is consistent with the new assessment system and to help answer any difficult questions or obstacles that arise during the one-on-one trainings.
- ***Engage the core curriculum committee to help define the PLOs for the core (TUG).*** The Associate Dean of Assessment and Student Success and the Dean of Curriculum and Accreditation have already begun meeting with the faculty co-chair of the core curriculum committee to determine a work plan for the committee during the next two years. Currently, the plan is to have the core curriculum committee focus specifically on further defining the two learning outcomes that will be assessed primarily within the core: Civic and Global Engagement, and Broad and Integrative Knowledge. The goal will be to develop common rubrics for each outcome, most likely utilizing some of the AAC&U VALUE rubrics as a starting point.
- ***Educate the division chairs in the area of assessment of student learning (TUG).*** The Associate Dean of Assessment and Student Success will spend time at the division chair retreats and bi-weekly meetings going over the new system for assessment and explaining the role of the chairs as assessment facilitators within their respective divisions.
- ***Conduct assessment workshops at faculty work days).*** During faculty work days, the VP for Undergraduate Education will dedicate space to discuss and build capacity in the area of assessment. These sessions will focus on topics in accordance with the timeline outlined above.

Appendices

Appendix A: Traditional Undergraduate College - Annual Reports by Division

Business Division

I. Divisional Summary of Assessment of Student Learning

- a. Describe the general status of program-level assessment plans in the division
 - i. All the program level assessment plans are complete except for those of which we do not have a faculty member in that discipline. Those without a plan are:
 1. Sports Management
 2. International Business
 3. Marketing
 - ii. Those with an assessment plan:
 1. Economics
 2. Business Administration
 3. Finance
 4. Management
 5. Non-Profit
 6. Accounting
 7. Computer Information Systems
- b. Identify some common next steps related to program assessment plans
 - i. Each area will work with the Division Chair in the Fall to go over the assessment plan and also write out three goals for that major
 - ii. Course level assessment will take place in each area
 - iii. The MFAT will be administered Spring 2017 which covers all disciplines
- c. Describe the types of assessment activities conducted this academic year:
 - i. The Division of Business program has clearly stated divisional goals as well as specific desired degree outcomes for each established major within the division, including Accounting, Business Administration, Computer Information Systems, Economics, Finance, International Business, Management, Marketing, Non-Profit Administration and Sports Management. We are working to complete formal course level assessments for at least one course in each major. (These will be included in the Division of Business Annual Assessment Report for June 2017)
 - ii. The Division of Business assesses achievement of the learning outcomes. The Division of Business Curricular Objectives provide benchmarks that measure specific learning outcomes for each major. Competencies determined by the Division of Business program are measured through students' evaluations of

course objectives, internship evaluations, and input from the Division of Business Student Advisory Council (SAC), assignments and standardized testing such as the TUCE (Test of Understanding in Economics) and the MFT (Major Field Test) in Business. The MFT in Business is completed annually in the Division of Business capstone course; and outcomes specific to objectives in each major in the Division of Business.

- iii. The Division of Business program uses information from assessment to improve student learning. Program and major objectives determined by the Division of Business are measured through students' evaluations of course objectives, MFT, TUCE, examinations, student projects, and student presentations. (See major-specific assessment plans included in Division of Business Annual Assessment Report). Students also complete an evaluation of their internship.
 - iv. The Student Advisory Council (SAC) will assess career services, division events, program offerings, co-curricular items such as ENACTUS .
 1. SAC meets every six weeks to discuss issues such as internships, core courses in business (Principles of Management and Business Communications), our B2B, and graduation events, the 'Our Father's Business' series, 'Executive Lecture Series,' and suggestions new programming.
 2. This year SAC was critical in evaluating our new faculty hires in Accounting and Management. They sat in on a guest lecture and then posted their comments which were used in determining the final candidate
 3. SAC evaluated our various Divisional events such as Our Father's Business, Executive Lecture Series, and our 'Registration/Advisee Party.' They also are active participants in all of the aforementioned.
 - v. Creation of course-level assessments for at least one course for each faculty member providing written evidence by the end of the academic year 2016-2017 of making a decision(s) for at least one course based on the assessment matrix and utilization of a chosen instrument developed for each area. This process involved:
 1. outcome being assessed
 2. assessment tool
 3. assessment results
 4. recommendations 'close the loop'
- B. Personal Assessment:
- a. Personal Assessment includes a current CV and listing of the faculty members' professional and scholarly activities, etc. This task provides necessary data for the Division of Business ACBSP accreditation. As an ongoing practice at our Division of Business meetings, each faculty members gives an update on professional activities.
- C. 'IDEA' forms were completed by all business faculty in one of more courses for the academic year and will be reviewed Fall 2016 with each member. This time of evaluation and goal-setting

is called 'A Time to Look Forward.' For 2014 the instrument was expanded to include more individual goal-setting and a better tracking method to compare each year's goals to that which was accomplished.

- a. Individual budget requests – each faculty will be allotted \$1200. That amount can now be carried forward and back over a two-year period
 - b. Individual goals & objectives including writing, research, presentations.
 - c. Divisional Goals that should/could be shared
 - d. Desired Conferences
 - e. An addition was made for Fall 2014: a form was created which the faculty member will complete in advance and then at the end of the year or subsequent will be analyzed in terms of accomplishment.
- D. During 2016-2017 faculty will be encouraged to attend various off and on-campus workshops that focus on assessment, accreditation, faculty development, and pedagogy, all aimed at increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of delivering our shared university goals with our majors.
- a. One faculty member attended the Lily conference in Traverse City
 - b. No faculty members attended the CBFA conference fall 2015 at Regent University however plans include attending the Fall CBFA conference at Regent University.
 - c. Accounting faculty attended various regional and national conferences throughout the year
 - d. The economics faculty attended the Free Market Forum in Omaha, Nebraska in October 2015.
- E. A 'Division Chair' internal assessment was implemented Fall 2013. This is not an anonymous review, but a face to face discussion with each faculty member on the Chair's effectiveness.
- F. We held an All-DAY PLANNING & ASSESSMENT MEETING DECEMBER 11TH, 2015
- A. Faculty Updates
 - B. Evaluation of Spring 2016 subscriptions and adjuncts
 - C. Fall 2016 schedule discussion
 - D. Yearly conference reporting
 - E. Spring Event Preview
 - F. PR-JRN course offerings discussion
 - G. Updating the divisional overviews in the CU catalog
 - H. Updating business electives in the CU catalog on a 3 and 4-year cycle
 - I. Evaluation of Enrollment trends and summary statistics
- G. All-Day PLANNING & ASSESSMENT MEETING May 5TH, 2016

II. **Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning – SEE EACH MAJOR PLAN IN OUR MOODLE ASSESSMENT FOLDER**

Communications and Media Division

I. Divisional Summary of Assessment of Student Learning.

In August of 2015, the current chair of the division Pete Muir who had held the position since 2010 moved to a full-time administrative position as the Dean of Accreditation and Curriculum. Given the relative sudden change, the timeliness so close to Fall semester, and the lack of consensus of a replacement within the division, the chair of the music division Michael Stockdale assumed dual responsibilities as interim chair of C&M.

To some extent, that decision moved the division into caretaker mode and each of the departments spent the year operating very much in a *steady as she goes* frame. That is reflected in the sparseness of this report compared to previous years. Only two proposals for curriculum change from the division hit UAC (digital media and journalism) compared to the multiple program tweaks in 14/15. The division rarely met together and did not convene for a specific assessment day as they had for the previous two years. There was forward progress in the creation of Student Learning Outcome Maps (SLOs) for most of the majors in C&M and those are addressed in the divisional reports.

The most significant step forward in the department was the growth of the Digital Media major. The major is comprised of curricula elements from audio production, film production, photography and a strong emphasis in graphic/web design. The major grew from 4 to 20 students and, after undertaking a cost/benefit analysis, it was agreed to discontinue the collaborative arrangement with Aquinas College and seek a full-time faculty member for our campus. That hire was completed in March/April and Chad LaForce will be joining the division in the Fall semester. Accompanying the hire was the Proposal for Curricular Change (*Appendix I*) which moved the five-course sequence of drawing and design classes formally to our campus. More work will be needed to define distinct learning outcomes for this program.

In March 2016 it was announced that Desiree Duff would take over as chair beginning June 1 which should provide some stability and a better foundation to launch curriculum reform. To this end, UAC identified several programs that did not reach criteria of a healthy academic program. Three of those programs are in C&M – Photography, Public Relations and Journalism. Des has been charged with preparing the programs for review by UAC in the Fall semester.

II. Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning

a. Audio Department Assessment Report 2015-2016

Division of Communication & Media

i. Learning categories of the Audio Department

1. Producer
 - a. Overall vision of project
 - b. Manage time and resources of project
2. Record/Capture
3. Edit
4. Mix

- 5. Master
 - 6. Overall Competency in Pro Tools
 - ii. These skills were assimilated into a first draft Audio SLO map (*Appendix III*). More work over the course of the 2016/2017 year will be needed to refine and quantify these towards assessable program outcomes and identifiable artifacts linked to these PLOs.
 - iii. No demonstrable progress was made on a second tier live sound engineering course.
 - iv. The only curricula change was the introduction of MDA 383 Mastering as a stand-alone course from the previous combined Mixing and Mastering course. Initial responses to the course from students have been positive.
- b. Communication Department Assessment Report 2015-2016**
Division of Communication & Media
- i. The COM department welcomed Jeremy Osborn as the first new hire in recent memory, returning the department to two faculty members for the first time since Michael Cuffman left in 2008. Jeremy's doctorate and experience has added strong voice to assessment of the three strands – general COM, broadcast COM, and Strategic COM. While the current SLO are attached for the general and broadcast strands (*Appendices IV and V*), it is clear that more work will need to be done to assess the relevance and design of the programs, particularly in light of the program review for Public Relations. In light of this review, there was no specific SLO map created for either of these programs.
 - ii. Of note is the relatively 'stalling' of Health communication. No students have enrolled in the program and while it has a three-year window to 'perform', there is little drive within the department for this program. The institution is investigating a program in Health care administration which may replace the idea of a health COM degree.
 - iii. The only significant change in curriculum was the introduction of a COM 112 section that was taught online over the summer semester. The new chair will work with the instructional designer to gather data for assessment of the student learning in this mode.
- c. Film and Video Production Department Assessment Report 2015-2016**
- i. The FVP department went through a tremendous upheaval with the departure of two faculty members. Essentially this means that the department cannot exist with the current curriculum and has triggered an informal program review targeting the redesign of skills, knowledge and attributes (SLOs). The current model is attached to this document (*Appendix VI*). Clearly no assessment work can be undertaken until the learning outcomes are redefined and matched with the resources, particularly human resources.
- d. Journalism Department Assessment Report 2014-2015**
- i. After planting six separate strand of the Journalism degree in 2014/2015, there was no strong growth in any of these programs. This is a contributing factor to

the need to do a formal review of the journalism program (including all strands) to evaluate the future. Assessment data will place a significant role in this process. A combined Journalism SLO map is attached (*Appendix VII*).

- ii. Journalism reengaged an off-campus study program in Washington D.C. After discontinuing the collaboration with the Washington Journalism Institute in 2013 due to financial issues, the King College program seems a more appropriate and responsible partnership. This was approved through UAC and the Proposal for Curricular Change is included in this report (*Appendix II*).

Humanities Division

I. Divisional Summary of Assessment of Student Learning

a. Describe the general status of program-level assessment plans in the division

The Humanities Division has begun the process of recreating the current existing SLOs (Student Learning Outcomes), by developing them into PLOs (Program Learning Outcomes). Thus far the division has developed tiers 1 and 2 of the PLOs for the Spanish, History, Creative Writing, Professional Writing, Literature, Linguistics, and Philosophy programs.

b. Identify some common next steps related to program assessment plans

We will work to complete Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for every divisional program. We will also finalize the Program Purpose Statements. Next, we will work on curricular mapping to connect the curriculum and artifacts to PLOs.

c. Describe the types of assessment activities conducted this academic year

This year our division assistant, Patricia Pickens, uploaded our current assessment materials onto the Humanities Assessment Moodle page. She also compiled old assessment data and fit into the new assessment template. These templates were the starting point for our May 2016 workshop discussions on developing new PLOs.

d. Explain what has been done at the divisional level to facilitate assessment work this year (i.e. trainings, workshops, meetings, etc.)

In order to facilitate assessment work during the 2015-2016 school year, the division held divisional meetings focused on assessment. Also, Michael Van Dyke has shared information from the Assessment Committee. Emily Gratson attended a divisional workshop on assessment on May 12, 2016 and coached us through the initial process of developing PLOs.

e. Articulate a divisional action plan for 2016-2017 to facilitate assessment within each major

In order to facilitate assessment within each major for 2016-2017 the Humanities Division plans to

- i. Hold at least one assessment meeting/semester to give program assessment updates and continue to progress toward completing our assessment plan.
- ii. Plan an assessment workshop at the conclusion of spring semester that will include artifact sharing. Tentatively scheduled for May 2017.

- iii. Meet with each faculty member to discuss program assessment.
- iv. Obtain assessment coaching while we craft our PLOs and prepare for future assessment projects.

Kinesiology, Science and Math Division

I. Divisional Summary of Assessment of Student Learning

- a. Describe the general status of program-level assessment plans in the division: All of the division programs have Steps 1 and 2 completed, though the PLO's will require significant revision for almost every program. Most are written as goals rather than being measurable and evidence-based. A number of the programs have too many PLO's and they will need to be revised so that the assessment effort will be sustainable.
- b. Identify some common next steps related to program assessment plans: The PLO's need to be revised, critiqued, and rewritten, probably through multiple iterations involving multiple division personnel, in order to get them to a point where alignment with courses and identification of artifacts would be meaningful and efficient. This would most certainly be done most efficiently in conjunction with training and assistance from assessment coaches during division-wide assessment work day(s). This initial effort is being planned for late August.
- c. Describe the types of assessment activities conducted this academic year: Assessment activities conducted this year included the initial completion through step 2 and training division personnel on the new system for assessment. A Moodle course has been established containing assessment documents for each program within the division.
- d. Explain what has been done at the divisional level to facilitate assessment work this year (i.e. trainings, workshops, meetings, etc.): Assessment was a frequent topic in division meetings and division personnel recognize the importance of being able to demonstrate that we are accomplishing our objectives. Division personnel also attended faculty-wide training sessions on assessment (such as were held during the faculty work days.) Some meetings were also held at the department level (kinesiology, for example) to work through some of the PLO's in small groups.
- e. Articulate a divisional action plan for 2016-2017 to facilitate assessment within each major: We anticipate holding one or two division work-days during August to attempt to revise the PLO's in a group setting. This would allow those who have a good understanding of quality in regard to PLO's to help and train those with less experience/aptitude. Progress on assessment projects is also anticipated to be a discussion item for multiple division meetings.

II. Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning

- a. BA Biology
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be

completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.

- ii. Assessment Report
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- b. BA Biology for Secondary Teachers
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 - 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 - 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
 - ii. Assessment Report
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- c. BA Integrated Comprehensive Science for Secondary Teachers
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 - 1. Describe the current status and quality of the assessment plan based on the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"
 - 2. Identify specific next steps for assessment of student learning in 2016-2017 based on the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"
 - ii. Assessment Report*
 - 1. Describe assessment activity during 2015-2016 and identify its connection to the program learning outcomes
 - 2. Explain the results and identify actions that were/are being made to improve student learning based on the assessment results
- d. BA Integrated Science Group for Elementary Teachers
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 - 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 - 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be

completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.

- ii. Assessment Report
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- e. BA Integrated Science for Secondary Teachers
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 - 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 - 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
 - ii. Assessment Report
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- f. BA Mathematics
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 - 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 - 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
 - ii. Assessment Report
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- g. BA Mathematics for Secondary Teachers
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):

1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
- ii. Assessment Report
1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- h. BA Physical Education for K—12 Certification**
- i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's should be evaluated for quality. Step 3, curricular mapping has been accomplished but the courses have not been tied to the individual PLO's. In addition, Step 4, identification of artifacts, has also been accomplished though not tied to the PLO's that they measure.
 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 (tying the courses to their PLO's) with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
- ii. Assessment Report
1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with significant progress toward completion of Steps 3 and 4. Additional assessment work included training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- i. BS Biology—Pre-Dental
1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
- ii. Assessment Report

1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- j. BS Biology—Pre-Medical**
- i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the “Student Learning Assessment Checklist”):
 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
 - ii. Assessment Report
 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- k. BS Biology—Pre-Pharmacy**
- i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the “Student Learning Assessment Checklist”):
 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
 - ii. Assessment Report
 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- l. BS Biology—Pre-Veterinary**
- i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the “Student Learning Assessment Checklist”):
 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be

completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.

- ii. Assessment Report
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- m. BS Environmental Biology
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 - 1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
 - 2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.
 - ii. Assessment Report
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- n. BS Exercise Science
 - i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):
 - 1. Current status and quality: Steps 1—4 of the checklist have been completed, however, the number of PLO's is far too many to keep assessment of the program manageable.
 - 2. Next steps: The number of PLO's needs to be reduced to 3—5 with subsequent realignment of the courses (Step 3) and the artifacts (Step 4) to these fewer PLO's. Given how far along this program is in the process, Step 5, the development of descriptive rubrics for each PLO, might be able to be accomplished during the 2016-2017 academic year.
 - ii. Assessment Report*
 - 1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1—4 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.
- o. BS Exercise Science—Cardiac Rehabilitation Concentration
 - 1. Current status and quality: As a Concentration under the Exercise Science program, this program includes the (too many) PLO's issue addressed for that program above. In addition, Step 1, drafting of the

program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's, are complete for this specific concentration (though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.)

2. Next steps: The reduction in the number of PLO's for the root program will need to be accomplished and then the concentration-specific PLO should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with the PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.

ii. Assessment Report

1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1—4 on the Exercise Science program above while the concentration-specific PLO has been completed through Step 2. This also included initial training of personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.

p. BS Exercise Science—Pre-Occupational Therapy Concentration

1. Current status and quality: As a Concentration under the Exercise Science program, this program includes the (too many) PLO's issue addressed for that program above. In addition, Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's, are complete for this specific concentration (though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.)
2. Next steps: The reduction in the number of PLO's for the root program will need to be accomplished and then the concentration-specific PLO should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with the PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.

ii. Assessment Report

1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1—4 on the Exercise Science program above while the concentration-specific PLO has been completed through Step 2. This also included initial training of personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.

q. BS Exercise Science—Pre-Physical Therapy Concentration

1. Current status and quality: As a Concentration under the Exercise Science program, this program includes the (too many) PLO's issue addressed for that program above. In addition, Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's, are

complete for this specific concentration (though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.)

2. Next steps: The reduction in the number of PLO's for the root program will need to be accomplished and then the concentration-specific PLO should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with the PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.

ii. Assessment Report

1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1—4 on the Exercise Science program above while the concentration-specific PLO has been completed through Step 2. This also included initial training of personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.

r. BS Mathematics

i. Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the "Student Learning Assessment Checklist"):

1. Current status and quality: Step 1, drafting of the program purpose statement, and Step 2, establishing quality PLO's are complete, though the PLO's have not been evaluated for quality.
2. Next steps: The PLO's should be evaluated for quality and rewritten as necessary. Then Step 3, completion of curricular mapping should be completed in Fall 2016 with Step 4, Identifying specific artifacts associated with each PLO, being completed in the Spring 2017 semester.

ii. Assessment Report

1. The assessment work that was completed during 2015-2016 included Steps 1 and 2 above along with training personnel in regard to PLO's and the new assessment program process. Assessment materials have been posted on Moodle to make them available to faculty and staff.

Music Division

I. Divisional Summary of Assessment of Student Learning

- a. *Describe the general status of program-level assessment plans in the division.* The Music Division entered the 2015-16 season with only three of four full-time positions filled. As the division lacks a large number of faculty or program leaders, much of the assessment work falls to the chair by default. Several program updates had been made during the previous season that were put into effect for the first time in 2015-16 including:
 - i. Expanded prescribed elective options for Worship Arts majors in addition to course changes in the bible minor
 - ii. Increased Large Ensemble requirements for all music programs
 - iii. Increase in Performance Lab requirements for all music programs (and course name change from "Music Convocation")
 - iv. Revision to delivery of Pedagogy (only required by performance majors)
 - v. Course revision and name change from Performance: CCM to Performance: Commercial Music

The Music Division does not have a department structure based upon degree programs, but rather has maintained program directors that are cross-curricular, e.g., Director of Instrumental Studies. With a reduction in faculty, there are however gaps in program leadership, not least of which is the area of Music Education. All the distinct Music Education content is taught by various adjuncts. One of those adjuncts, Kathy Van Dessel, has chosen to invest themselves in helping review and reshape the program as needed. As a result, last fall we submitted a proposal for a revision to the Music: Elementary Methods course, increasing the credits from 2 to 3 (see attachments). This brings the course into compliance with state standards and other like programs. This change will be in effect beginning Fall 2016 and will apply to all students regardless of catalog date.

Other assessment work for the division included the creation of SLO Curricular Maps (see attachments) for all our degree programs. This work was completed by the division chair utilizing the curricular work done for the last National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) self-study document. There are still refinements needed for these curricular maps to better focus the overarching goals and objectives of each program.

One of the key problems this process revealed to us was the lack of systematic and summarized review of the data collected from our various assessment artefacts (jury sheets, sophomore evaluations, recital evaluations, etc.) In the past, the need for program change has more frequently been revealed to us through anecdotal means. We will be challenged further this coming season as we will be reduced to two full-time positions making a committee approach to assessment virtually impossible.

- b. *Articulate a divisional action plan for 2016-2017 to facilitate assessment within each major.* This summer the division chair will complete the required self-study document for our NASM site visit slated for the fall semester. This document will be a revision of the original self-study that demonstrates how we meet NASM standards. The last study and site visit revealed several areas of non-compliance that we have systematically addressed since 2010. It is anticipated that the new facilities will address in part NASM concerns over our lack of adequate physical resources for the program. However, the drop in number of faculty and “orphan” degree programs may be an issue for us.

Assessment goals for the coming season will include refinements to the curricular maps, review and revision of assessment artefacts and the implementation of summary reports for those artefacts. Additional review of elements of the Music Education program will also be considered.

Social Sciences Division

I. Divisional Summary of Assessment of Student Learning

- a. During this academic year, faculty members worked on PLO maps for their respective programs. As can be seen by the summaries below, we are at different points in developing the assessment plans. Some are much further along than others. Social Work is faced with the challenge of fitting CSWE standards, which will change after its response to the current CSWE report is submitted during Summer, 2016, to the CU assessment template. Dr. Sanders will meet with Ms. Gratson, or one of the faculty assessment advisors, to determine next steps. The work completed this year can be found on the Moodle site.
- b. A review of the PLOs for each program suggest that next year, some attention needs to be given to ensuring that each course connected to a PLO “has at least one course outcome that connects back to that PLO.” (#3 of Assessment Checklist). Having done so, it will be important to review the courses artifacts (to ensure that (1) each PLO has a minimum of two artifacts and (2) one is from a lower level course in the program, and one from an upper level course. These will be the “next steps” for all programs in addition to any program-specific “next steps” outlined below.
- c. The division action plan for 2016-17 includes the following:
 - 1) Ask each faculty member responsible for a program to complete an assessment of student learning checklist to determine which activities still need to be completed. Evidence of completion should be submitted to Moodle and copies provided to the Division Chair.
 - 2) Determine whether each course in the curriculum ties directly back to a Program Learning Objective.
 - 3) Determine whether courses designated as addressing a given Program Learning Objective have outcomes that tie directly back to that Program Learning Outcome.
 - 4) Determine whether the artifacts (minimum of two) for each PLO are from both lower level and advanced level courses.

In those instances in which the answer to numbers two, three, or four above is “no,” faculty will be expected to work on and submit that material prior to the start of Spring semester 2017.

- 5) During Spring semester, faculty should begin work on developing descriptive rubrics for each PLO if they have not yet been developed.

II. Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning

- a. Community Health
 - i. **Current Status** – During the 2015-16 academic year, the purpose statement, student learning outcomes, and curricular map were revised. Previously, there were 8 student outcomes based upon Community Health Standards. These were collapsed

to three measurable outcomes, one of which is a knowledge outcome. The others are skill-based outcomes. The PLO identifies the respective standards that fit under each objective and the courses in which those objectives are addressed.

- ii. **Next Steps** – During 2016-17, specific learning objectives for each course will be mapped on the program learning outcomes. In addition, specific artifacts to be used at the lower and upper levels to assess the PLOs will be identified.

b. Psychology, Child and Adolescent Concentration

- i. **Current Status** - We have worked to collapse the previous 17-objective framework into four broad program goals and six degree outcomes. Each course in the CAS concentration has been mapped to the degree outcomes, and specific assessment artifacts have been identified to support each degree outcome. The SLO map has been uploaded into the Division Assessment folder in Moodle.
- ii. **Next Steps** - Beginning with Fall 2016 course offerings, each course in the CAS major will be reviewed as they are offered to tweak course learning objectives and to write rubrics (if they don't already exist) for those assignments included on the updated SLO map. Each syllabus will also contain a table presenting connections between degree outcomes, course objectives and specific course assessments; this will strengthen the student's understanding of how course assignments are used in assessing desired learning outcomes. Another project will come in the adjustment of the Senior Portfolio assignment and rubric, which will be revised to reflect the new simplified objectives.

c. Psychology, Counseling and Marriage and Family

- i. **Current Status** – -- Seventeen objectives that were previously assessed for psychology majors were collapsed into four main outcome objectives during the 2015-2016 school year.

World View and Culture – integration of biblical concepts and Christian theology with psychology corresponds to our mission as a Christian Liberal Arts Institution. This outcome will be examined and assessed multiple times by various research papers and critiques. For example, students in Theories of Personality choose a particular theory of personality and critique it from a biblical perspective. The class, History and Systems, requires a critique of a particular system from a Christian worldview.

Sociocultural awareness locally and abroad is a vital emphasis in the psychology Program. One specific class, Cross-Cultural psychology, devotes an entire class on this subject. Another class, Marriage & Family Counseling, addresses different counseling approaches and styles used with various cultural backgrounds.

Research – research skills that involve critical reviews of psychological literature, designing and carrying out an experiment, collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data, and ethics are key expectations of each student that majors in psychology. Assessment of these objectives are most concentrated in PSY 355/356, Integrated Statistics and Research Methods.

Theory and Concepts – this outcome objective is concerned with each student being able to demonstrate understanding of, appreciation for, and application of the major theories in psychology. In addition, the program aims for each psychology major to have the ability to explain major concepts in such areas as developmental, social, physiological, cognitive, counseling, abnormal, and personality. This objective is assessed in many courses by means of papers, critiques, reaction and reflective essays, and pre-and posttest exams. The most inclusive assessment is the Major Field Assessment Test given to seniors to assess whether they have a comprehensive understanding of the various fields of psychology.

Professional Development – one of the major goals of the psychology program at CU is to prepare students to engage in activities that prepare them for life after graduation. This objective includes preparation for graduate school and employment in human service organizations. Writing APA style papers, classroom presentations, conducting research, understanding core ethical principles/codes, interviewing skills, and diagnosing mental disorders are all significant skills necessary for this kind of preparation.

Classes such as Abnormal Psychology, Theories of Counseling, Marriage and Family Counseling, Senior Seminar, and Internships are integral in meeting this objective.

- ii. **Next Steps** – All rubrics will be examined for each class assignment beginning Fall, 2016.

The goal is to use the same rubric for similar assignments such as research papers, classroom presentations, and reaction papers/critiques. Using the same rubric across the curriculum will make it easier to assess progress in meeting the learning objectives.

Course objectives will be reviewed in each course offered in both concentrations to better align them with the new program learning objectives.

Degree outcomes will be added in each syllabus along with course objectives and assessment of course artifacts.

d. Psychology, General Psychology Concentration

- i. **Current Status** - In the Fall semester of 2015 I mapped the courses in the General Psychology Concentration to the corresponding degree outcomes, and listed the artifacts that we planned on using to assess the learning outcomes for each course. In the Spring, 2016 I replaced the set of artifacts we had originally planned with a shorter set of artifacts that will better represent the assessment of each learning outcome.
- ii. **Next Steps** - Calculate the difference between last year's assessment measures for each of the program outcomes (MFT-assessment and rubrics) and the ones obtained for this past year. These results will be tentative, because at this point, it is difficult to determine precisely which students opted for the General Psychology Concentration, and which were in previous catalogs and changed to other concentrations.

e. Social Work

- i. **Current Status** – Currently, the social work program is in the final stages of compiling its annual evaluative document which assesses the program's overall curriculum in promoting student proficiency in ten core competencies and their corresponding practice behaviors as required by the Council on Social Work Education. To date, we have posted copies of our curriculum map and evaluative cycle in the Social Work folder of the Social Science Moodle page, as well as last year's Evaluative Document.
- ii. **Next Steps** - Our next steps include the following:
 - 1. Step 1: Complete the 2015-2016 Evaluative Document by the end of May, early June, 2016;
 - 2. Step 2: Complete a progress report for CSWE by mid-June, 2016; and
 - 3. Step 3: Meet with the director of institutional assessment and discuss how to make social work's evaluative process compatible with CU's learning objectives by mid-June, 2016 or in August of 2016.

Teacher Education Division

Divisional Summary of Assessment of Student Learning

Teacher Education is involved in continuous program improvement and assessment through state and national accreditation. Each year the MDE disseminates the Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score which informs the division's program and curricular changes. The overall score is composed of the following elements:

MTTC subject area tests:

To calculate the MTTC component score, the MDE uses a three-year combined passing percentage of all MTTC content/subject-area tests. Our overall 2015 score was 91.7% (M=86.1), 6th highest in the state; 2016, 93.9 (M=85.6). We did go up one full percentage point for our overall MTTC score (all subject areas) from last year – 5th highest MTTC score in the state.

State surveys:

According to MDE, the satisfactory ranking includes Teacher Candidates (student teachers) who report a high level of program efficacy with regard to their teacher preparation, including clinical experiences and supervising faculty at EPIs (university supervisors) who consistently substantiate the positive program efficacy perceptions of their teacher candidates.

University Supervisors and Student Teachers report program efficacy through surveys which include the following areas: preparation of the program in regards to learning experiences, organizing the learning environment, applying critical thinking to content, connecting teaching to real world problems to local and global issues, addressing the needs of special populations, using technology to maximize learning, effective use of assessments and data, field experiences and clinical practice.

For our 2015 state score, the combined percentage for these two surveys was 95.5 (M=94.4), 13th in the state. For 2016, the score was 94.6 (M=94.5). Our student teacher and university supervisor surveys were 94.6, 16th in the state - down from 95.5, 13th in the state in 2015.

See state survey results document in the Teacher Education Division Assessment Data folder on Moodle.

Teacher Effectiveness Rating:

This component is comprised of graduates who almost exclusively earn Effective or Highly Effective ratings during their first three years of eligibility to earn those ratings while employed in Michigan public schools within five years since graduation (MDE). Our score for 2015 is 82.9% (M=81.8), 10th in the state. The score for 2016 was 83.4 (M=82.6). While our program certainly has an influence on this rating, some aspects are out of our control. This change in K-12 teacher evaluation has been an

adjustment for school districts across the state. Our Teacher Effectiveness rating is 8th in the state at 83.4, up from 82.9, 10th in the state in 2015.

2015 overall score of three components:

- 91.5% (84.5 cut score), the fourth highest ranking of all public and private institutions in the state (33)

2016 overall score of three components:

- 91.0% (84.5 cut score), 7th highest ranking in the state out of 33 public and private institutions

EPI Performance Score	MTTC subject area tests	State Surveys	Teacher Effectiveness	Overall score
2014 (trial)	90.9	94.4	82.2	89.5
2015	91.7	95.5	82/9	91.5
2016	93.9	94.6	83.4	91.0

Shared Next Steps for Teacher Education Division

Identify the purpose/mission statements of the Elementary Education and Secondary Education programs. Identify the program learning outcomes (PLOs) for each as an extension of the current SLOs (see document in the Teacher Education Division Assessment Data folder on Moodle and note below under I. e. – Next Steps).

2015-2016 Assessment Activities:

- Course revisions and new textbook adoptions
Education faculty were asked to consider the rationale/results of the change and how it benefited student learning (outcomes) and met the objectives for the course. See document in the Teacher Education Division Assessment Data folder on Moodle.
- 2016 Spring Preliminary and Post Student Teacher Assessments: Please see survey compilation documents in Moodle folder (all students’ summary, elementary and secondary summaries).
- *The minimum targeted percentile goal is 80%.*

Summary: For the highest rated of “agree”, students assessed their post knowledge and implementation of all items higher than their prior knowledge. The one exception was being able to use many reading and writing strategies.

For example, 78% of the student teachers felt they were prepared to write effective lesson plans before student teaching (preliminary assessment) as compared with 100% when they completed student teaching (post assessment). This met the student learning outcome (see SLO mapping template on Moodle) of selecting appropriate instructional goals and creating effective lesson plans.

Assessed areas under 80%:

Seventy-five percent of student teachers felt that **they understood strategies for classroom management** after they had completed student teaching. Recent changes of the Teacher Assistant Practicum in seminar curriculum over time should strengthen the current SLO of knowledge of proper pedagogy.

Meeting the needs of special needs students was a post area below 80% that has been identified in past year's assessments. Beginning in 2015, all elementary students are required to take EDU-230, Introduction to Special Education and the Exceptional Learner. Secondary students will receive intentional instruction for special needs students in EDU-344, Content Area Literacy. Also, all education students will receive special education information in EDU-363, Diverse Populations and Differentiated Instruction. It is expected over time that the percentage of students who agree that they have been prepared to meet the needs of special needs students will increase due to these changes in the curriculum.

Another area below 80% for the post assessment was **the use of reading and writing strategies**. Looking at the elementary and secondary summaries, it appears that while fewer elementary students agreed with a 5 "Agree" rating in their preliminary assessment (4 out of 8) than secondary (7 out of 8), 7 out of 9* elementary agree at the end of student teaching that they were prepared in this area as compared to 5 out of 8 secondaries. The preliminary assessment for both elementary and secondary students was 72% as compared to 65% post. Thus, if this trend were to continue, it would be worth looking at the reasons why secondary are not feeling as prepared as elementary. Reading and writing was not listed in the narrative analysis as a repetitive idea for improvement, concerns or worries.

Integrating multicultural perspectives into lessons was below 80%. Intentional integration of this area along with understanding classroom management and meeting the needs of special needs students into all education classes is a recommendation. These areas have been noted on this assessment in the past few years. EDU-363, Diverse Populations and Differentiated Instruction, will continue to address the integration of multicultural perspectives and can adjust curriculum as needed.

**One elementary student did not submit a preliminary assessment document at the beginning of the semester.*

ALL STUDENTS SUMMARY	Preliminary Assessment	Post Assessment
1. I am prepared to write effective lesson plans .	78%	100%
2. I am prepared to write effective unit plans .	38%	85%
3. I understand strategies for classroom management .	33%	75%
4. I am prepared to meet the needs of special needs students .	28%	30%
5. I am prepared to interact with students and teachers on a professional level.	78%	100%
6. I am prepared to integrate multicultural perspectives in lessons.	67%	70%
7. I am prepared to apply the knowledge base for teaching to ensure the learning success of all students.	61%	85%
8. I am prepared to assess student progress.	50%	94%
11. I am able to use many reading and writing strategies .	72%	65%
12. The EDU courses gave me the opportunity to consider the implications of educational theory and philosophy as they interact with biblical principles .	55%	80%
13. The EDU courses encouraged me to become a lifelong learner .	67%	95%
14. Overall, I feel prepared to enter into the teaching profession.	61%	90%

- Principal survey summary (principals who have hired CU graduates):
The Principal Survey was sent to principals in the West Michigan area during the fall 2015 semester. Please see survey summary in the Teacher Education Division Assessment Data folder.

All of the scaled items received a 1 (“Entered Prepared”) or a 2 (“Needed some additional support or training by our district”). None of the questions received a 3 (Not well prepared).

Activities at the Divisional-level to Facilitate Assessment this Year

- CAEP conference at Hope College: Laurie Burgess (incoming chair) and Kerisa Myers (outgoing chair) attended. The conference covered the new CAEP standards and ways institutions can meet the standards for the next round of accreditation review.
- Division meetings discussions

- The Teacher Education division discussed aligning practicum assessments in order to track student growth.

Action Plan for 2016-2017:

- Develop current SLO map to include education courses, assignments and artifacts that align to Student Teaching (program) Learning Outcomes or a to be determined focus by the new division chair. Could divide these into the PLOs for the Elementary and Secondary Programs (see note in I. b.).
- Assessment of Student Learning checklist
- Determine first steps for CAEP National Accreditation Inquiry Brief (2019) and Audit (2020) including:
 - Determination of CAEP standard evidences
 - Determination of program claims corresponding to standards
 - Determination and development of evaluation tools
- Align Student Teaching and TAP evaluative instruments with future goal of statistical analysis in order to chart growth from the Teacher Assistant Practicum through student teaching to inform curricular revisions.
- World Language Program Review (Humanities and Teacher Education)
- Discuss with division the areas identified below the 80% targeted percentile goal on the 2016 spring post student teacher assessment.

Program-Level Assessment of Student Learning

- Assessment Plan (refer to program-specific SLO map & the “Student Learning Assessment Checklist”):
 - Describe the current status and quality of the assessment plan based on the “Student Learning Assessment Checklist”
- For each Teacher Education major and minor, the department has a program standards matrix of how each course within each major and minor meets the standards for that particular program (stored on division share drive).
- In past years, we used a 7 Teaching Roles model that is the foundational for our program and has served for assessment of student learning outcomes and student teaching evaluations. The teaching roles were included in the 2013 TEAC Inquiry Brief for national accreditation.
- The current student teaching evaluation is based on the Danielson model and is the focus of our current SLO map (in the Teacher Education Division Assessment Data folder).
 - Identify specific next steps for assessment of student learning in 2016-2017 based on the “Student Learning Assessment Checklist”

- The next step on the SLO map could be to have education faculty identify courses (Curriculum Correlation) and supply evidences (Artifacts) of how their courses and course assignments align to the Student Learning Outcomes.

Appendix B: Professional and Graduate Studies – Annual Report

Cornerstone University - Professional & Graduate Studies Annual Assessment Report 2015-2016

This report provides a summary of the assessment work within the Cornerstone University PGS Principal Academic Unit during the 2015-16 academic year.

The assessment report is divided into a number of sections that represent the various assessment projects completed at PGS within the past year. In addition, this report presents a summary of work conducted by the Cornerstone University Assessment Committee and the implications for ongoing and future assessment practices within PGS.

2015-2016 Assessment Projects - PGS

The PGS assessment projects for 2015-16 can be summarized in three main areas: (1) Assessment of a PGS Curricular Learning outcome, (2) Program review, and (3) Individual course review.

1) PGS Curricular Learning Outcome Review

The 2015-16 academic year saw the assessment of the overall Curricular Goal related to global learning:

Demonstrate cross-cultural communication and collaboration:

- a. *Understand one's culture in relation to other cultures*
- b. *Interact with people as a responsible member of the global community*

This learning outcome was assessed by faculty review of student papers across multiple degree programs in both the Business and Human Services divisions. The evaluation instrument consisted of measuring three sub-outcomes on a 5-point scale. The results are listed below by degree program.

Human Services Programs

Associate's degree in Human Services:

Student papers from the SOC-201 and the SOC-229 courses ($n = 20$) were reviewed by faculty. The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the ASHS program was **3.4/5**.

The sub-outcome results are as follows:

The paper demonstrates cross-cultural communication by understanding one's one culture in relation to other cultures: **2.6/5**

The paper demonstrates cross cultural collaboration by understanding one's own culture in relation to other cultures. **2.9/5**

The paper demonstrates interacting responsibly with people as a member of a global community. **4.6/5**

The assignment for the SOC-229 class called for students to create a list of local service agencies and the resources they provide. The design of this particular assignment made it difficult for the faculty reviewer to assess the global learning outcome. This negatively affected the total score for this degree program. In many cases the faculty only assigned a score for the final sub-outcome with an average score of **(4.6/5)**. The assignment for the SOC-211 class asked students for a book review on the story of someone fleeing genocide in their home country and moving to the US. This provided students with an opportunity to think through a wider range of cross-cultural issues. When the scores for the SOC-211 assignment are considered independently students scored much higher **(4.5/5)**.

Bachelor's in Ministry Leadership:

Student papers from the CMI-442 and the CMI-433 courses ($n = 20$) were reviewed by faculty. The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the BSML program was **4.3/5**.

The sub-outcome results are as follows:

The paper demonstrates cross-cultural communication by understanding one's one culture in relation to other cultures: **3.8/5**

The paper demonstrates cross cultural collaboration by understanding one's own culture in relation to other cultures. **4.3/5**

The paper demonstrates interacting responsibly with people as a member of a global community. **4.8/5**

The CMI-442 assignment asked for a personal statement of ethics – this is a helpful assignment in general, but provides limited ability to measure the global learning outcome. The CMI-433 assignment provides students with a way to compare world religions, and this gave greater opportunity for assessing the global learning outcome. Students in the BSML program scored highly on the third sub-outcome and future

course revisions can seek to enhance student thinking in terms of cross-cultural communication.

Bachelor's in Psychology:

Student papers from the PSY-332 and the PSY-455 courses ($n = 39$) were reviewed by faculty. The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the BSP program was **3.2/5**.

The sub-outcome results are as follows:

The paper demonstrates cross-cultural communication by understanding one's one culture in relation to other cultures: **2.6/5**

The paper demonstrates cross cultural collaboration by understanding one's own culture in relation to other cultures. **2.8/5**

The paper demonstrates interacting responsibly with people as a member of a global community. **3.8/5**

The PSY-455 assignment asked students to compile a list of local agencies offering services around a certain area of counseling or psychology. The PSY-332 assignment asked students to reflect on a personal cross-cultural immersion experience. Both assignments provided a solid basis for the review of this outcome.

The results for the BSP program showed a large range of demonstrated learning outcomes with lower scores for sub-outcomes 1 & 2, whereas students scored higher in sub-outcome 3. This is perhaps a reflection on the emphasis sub-outcome 3 places on responsible interaction between people, which is a broader aspect of learning within the BSP program. The results show that students are developing in the area of cross-cultural learning, but there are specific learning gains to be made in the areas of cross-cultural communication, understanding, and collaboration.

MA TESOL:

Student papers from the LIN-558 course ($n = 20$) were reviewed by faculty. The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the MA TESOL program was **3.8/5**.

The sub-outcome results are as follows:

The paper demonstrates cross-cultural communication by understanding one's one culture in relation to other cultures: **3.8/5**

The paper demonstrates cross cultural collaboration by understanding one's own culture in relation to other cultures. **3.7/5**

The paper demonstrates interacting responsibly with people as a member of a global community. **3.9/5**

The results indicate that students are tracking towards the higher end of developing cross-cultural competency as part of their degree program, but there is room for some growth in this area. Faculty comments often stated that students had a good general understanding of cross-cultural issues as they reflected on the assigned textbook, but needed to add to this basis by considering specific aspects of cultural communication.

MA Education:

Student papers from the EDU-553 and the EDU-511 courses ($n = 59$) were reviewed by faculty. The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the MAED program was **3.3/5**.

The sub-outcome results are as follows:

The paper demonstrates cross-cultural communication by understanding one's one culture in relation to other cultures: **3.2/5**

The paper demonstrates cross cultural collaboration by understanding one's own culture in relation to other cultures. **3.4/5**

The paper demonstrates interacting responsibly with people as a member of a global community. **3.5/5**

The results indicate that students are developing a base-level of cross-cultural competency as part of their degree program, but more focus can be paid to the areas of cross-cultural understanding and communication in particular. Faculty comments typically highlighted a foundational level of cross-cultural understanding, but more thinking was needed in making the connection between local and global communities.

Business Programs

Associate of Science in Business Studies

Student papers from the BUS-217 course ($n = 7$) were reviewed by faculty. A 5-point Likert scale was developed using the objectives for the assignment as written in the class. The papers were scored by faculty based on the rubric's criteria (see below).

- The paper addressed the impact or role globalization has made on a country's role in the global community **(3.2/5.0)**
- The paper addressed cultural nuances of doing business in the chosen country, identifying issues of cultural difference **(2.8/5.0)**
- The assignment addressed the political climate and how it impacts the global community **(3.0/5.0)**
- The assignment identified business opportunities and challenges **(3.2/5.0)**
- The assignment described the ethical- and values-based challenges a businessperson might face in conducting global business **(3.0/5.0)**

The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the ASBS program was **3.0/5.0**. Sub-outcome scores are noted above to the right of each objective criterion used to score the papers. It should be noted that 4 out of 7 papers were incomplete in some way. In 3 out of 7 papers, collaboration was developing, while CQ was competent. The results show that students are developing the capacity to demonstrate cross-cultural communication and collaboration, but there are specific learning gains to be made in the areas of cross-cultural communication, understanding, and collaboration, especially at the associate's degree level. However, with such a low sample size, no definitive conclusions can be drawn about student mastery of this objective.

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

Student papers from the BUS-318 course ($n = 16$) were reviewed by faculty. A 5-point Likert scale was developed using Livermore's CQ model. Students read a Livermore CQ book in this class and complete a critical analysis paper on the ideas in the book as they relate to other course content and readings. The rubric was built on the CQ model except for the last criterion, which emphasized practical application of the ideas. The papers were scored by faculty based on the rubric's criteria (see below). The individual averages for each sub-item on the rubric are noted in bold type to the right of the sub-item.

- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore's (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Drive) Dimension **(3.5/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore's (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Knowledge) Dimension **(3.5/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore's (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Strategy) Dimension **(3.6/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore's (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Action) Dimension **(3.6/5.0)**
- Practical Application: The assignment explained how CQ could have practical utility in a business or personal context **(4.3/5.0)**

The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the BSBA program was **3.7/5.0**, with sub-scores noted above in bold. Some papers missed an opportunity to redefine each CQ dimension and its corresponding sub-dimensions; some papers were too general; and some papers showed competency in the practical utility of CQ, yet the context was family, not business or intra-organizational context (which is satisfactory given the language of the rubric criterion but does raise a more foundational question as to the importance of one over the other—should the business context be privileged over the personal?). The results show that students are developing in the area of cross-cultural learning, but there are specific learning gains to be made in the areas of cross-cultural communication, understanding, and collaboration, especially from a comprehension-level understanding. A question that remains is at what level of learning should bachelor’s students be required to know and process this information?

Bachelor of Science in Management

Student papers from the BUS-318 course ($n = 54$) were reviewed by faculty. A 5-point Likert scale was developed using Livermore’s CQ model. Similar to the BSBA program, students take BUS-318 as part of their bachelor’s degree program in management and read a Livermore CQ book in this class along with completing a critical analysis paper on the ideas in the book as they relate to other course content and readings. Consequently, the BUS-318 course in both the BSBA and the BSM programs was used to assess the cycle 5 objective: Demonstrate cross-cultural communication and collaboration. This BUS-318 course was judged to be the most valid and reliable in terms of assessing the cultural objective in cycle 5—and for both programs. As with the BSBA program, the BSM rubric was built on the CQ Model except for the last criterion, which emphasized practical application of the ideas (Same rubric, then, was used for both programs). The papers were scored by faculty based on the rubric’s criteria (see below). The individual averages for each sub-item on the rubric is noted in bold type to the right of the sub-item.

- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore’s (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Drive) Dimension (**4.2/5.0**)
- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore’s (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Knowledge) Dimension (**4.2/5.0**)
- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore’s (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Strategy) Dimension (**4.0/5.0**)
- The assignment demonstrated comprehension-level mastery of Livermore’s (2015) Cultural Intelligence Model (Action) Dimension (**4.0/5.0**)
- Practical Application: The assignment explained how CQ could have practical utility in a business or personal context (**3.8/5.0**)

The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the BSM program was **4.0/5.0**, with sub-scores noted above in bold. Evaluators commented that 12 papers needed more depth information in the analysis, strategy, and application sections, while 2 papers were overly simplistic or self-focused rather than explanatory and 2 other papers noted as displaying awkwardness or confusion in misinterpretation of text, CQ action strategy, or were too self-focused in content. The results show that students appear to comprehend (the level of learning assessed at the bachelor's degree for this objective except for last objective, which is application level) cross-cultural communication and collaboration. Learning gains can be made in the areas of cross-cultural communication, understanding, and collaboration, especially with application, but from a comprehension-level understanding, which is higher than the knowledge level required at the associate's level, the students do seem to understand one's culture in relation to other cultures. A question that remains is at what level of learning should bachelor's students be required to know and process this information?

MBA

Student papers from the MGT-531 course ($n = 21$) were reviewed by faculty. A 5-point Likert scale was developed using Livermore's CQ model but at higher cognitive learning outcomes than at the bachelor's degree level (which also was assessed via Livermore's CQ model). In both the master of business administration (MBA) and master of management programs (MSM), students take MGT-531: Organizational Behavior and Change. Livermore's *Leading with Cultural Intelligence: The Real Secret to Success* is used as one of the texts in MGT-531. Students use a *Harvard Business Review* case study ("The Floundering Expatriate") to analyze cross-cultural communication and collaboration by applying the CQ model to the case. As the rubric criteria reveal below, student are asked to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information related to the model, thus employing the top four cognitive levels in Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. The papers were scored by faculty based on the rubric's criteria (see below).

- The assignment demonstrated analysis level mastery of the Cultural Intelligence Model (CQ) as applied to the selected case study **(4.5/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated application-level mastery of cross-cultural communication and collaboration in suggesting a development plan for the case study characters **(4.3/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated evaluation-level mastery of cross-cultural communication and collaboration and the CQ Model by judging specific organizational issues that should be addressed in the selected case **(4.5/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated synthesis-level master of cross-cultural communication and collaboration and the CQ model by integrating other sources (at least 1) in analyzing the CQ and Cultural Needs of the case study characters **(4.3/5.0)**

The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the MBA program was **4.4/5.0**. The individual averages for each sub-outcome on the rubric are noted in bold type to the right of the sub-item. The scores on the assessment indicate that students appear to have met this objective in the MBA program. It is of interest to note that evaluators recognized “more sources needed” by students to support their knowledge claims, a comment that reflects the higher order thinking and higher expectations of graduate-level work. Even though students seem to have met the cross-cultural communication and collaboration cycle 5 objective by applying the CQ model to the case, a few narrative comments highlighted areas for improvement: Five of 21 papers had comments about the need for more sources; two papers received comments about weak writing skills, overall, and most troubling, although it was just one paper, was one evaluator’s comment that one paper did not appear to meet graduate level writing standards.

MSM

Only five ($n = 5$) papers were able to be reviewed for the master of science in management (MSM) program. Similar to the MBA program, a 5-point Likert scale was developed using Livermore’s CQ model and at higher cognitive learning outcomes than for the bachelor’s degree (which also was assessed via Livermore’s CQ model). In both the master of business administration (MBA) and MSM, students take MGT-531: Organizational Behavior and Change. Livermore’s *Leading with Cultural Intelligence: The Real Secret to Success* is used as one of the text’s in MGT-531. Students use a *Harvard Business Review* case study (“The Floundering Expatriate”) to analyze cross-cultural communication and collaboration by applying the CQ model to the case. As the rubric criteria reveal below, student are asked to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information related to the model, thus employing the top four cognitive levels in Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives. The papers were scored by faculty based on the rubric’s criteria (see below).

- The assignment demonstrated analysis level mastery of the Cultural Intelligence Model (CQ) as applied to the selected case study **(4.8/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated application-level mastery of cross-cultural communication and collaboration in suggesting a development plan for the case study characters **(4.6/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated evaluation-level mastery of cross -cultural communication and collaboration and the CQ Model by judging specific organizational issues that should be addressed in the selected case **(4.6/5.0)**
- The assignment demonstrated synthesis-level master of cross-cultural communication and collaboration and the CQ model by integrating other sources (at least 1) in analyzing the CQ and Cultural Needs of the case study characters **(4.5/5.0)**

The overall average score for the global learning outcome for the MSM program was **4.6/5.0**. The individual averages for each sub-outcome on the rubric are noted in bold type to the right of the sub-item. The scores on the assessment indicate that students appear to have met this objective in the MSM program. It is of interest to note that only for this program did evaluators go out of their way to designate two papers as “excellent” and “model” papers for application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The other comments focused on the need for students to further explain or provide more detail for the development plan as part of their analysis within the assignment. No negative comments or areas for improvement were noted in these papers.

Table 1: Global Learning Outcome Average Scores by Degree Program

Program	ASHS	ASBS	BSML	BSPY	BSBA	BSM	MAED	TESOL	MBA	MSM
Avg. Score	3.4	3.0	4.3	3.2	3.7	4.0	3.3	3.8	4.4	4.6

2) Program Review:

Four PGS degree programs were reviewed during the 2015-16 academic year:

- a. **Bachelor of Science in Ministry Leadership:** The BSML was reviewed in early 2016 through feedback gained from a PGS faculty focus group, student end-of-course evaluations for the last three years, graduate/alumni surveys, and input from GRTS and TUG faculty. The PGS Academic Council approved the following changes to the program on May 11, 2016 based upon the program review findings:

- Revising the first course in the program to be more focused on Principles of Self-Management in Ministry
- Removing the Ephesians course as a requirement, adding a NT literature course in its place
- Reordering the course sequence
- Revising the balance of content in the two doctrine courses

PGS faculty also indicated that they would like to see a greater integration of Christian worldview material throughout the program, ways to encourage students to be more involved in their local churches, and finding ways to help students in their writing. These revisions will be included through the work of the curriculum review process.

- b. Bachelor of Science in Business Administration:** The BSBA program was reviewed in early 2016 through feedback gained from a PGS faculty focus group, student end-of-course evaluations for the last three years, graduate/alumni surveys, and input from individual student interviews and student and cohort focus groups. No individual course changes requiring Academic Council or Faculty Senate review were made to this program in the last year. Specific course-level changes to assignments, texts, objectives, and topics will be addressed within the new PGS curriculum review/revision process and are not mentioned here. The assessment comments will be summarized according to faculty views and student views.

Faculty Evaluation Comments and Concerns

- Concern about students performing at a level that meets professional skills in the work environment. There needs to be a transfer between education and application
- Should be a mapping of assignments at each level and expectations of students that are then shared with faculty teaching in the program
- Need to clearly articulate and communicate (different) levels of expectations for students in each of the programs and at each of the degree levels (associate's, bachelor's, master's)
- Emphasis needs to be communicated to the students that they are at college-level. Students need to prioritize "college life" with their work, family and other obligations.
- Program needs to grow and develop with the students, requiring different assignments at the end than at beginning of program
- Concern expressed about students needing to have extensive details, hand holding, and help that would not normally be expected in college.
- One faculty focus group member serves on an advisory board at Western Michigan University. Curriculum change is projected five years out. That university wants to have a competitive standing in the market because the industry is continually changing. **Where does Cornerstone sit in the market to be competitive?** was the most salient and convicting question asked during the focus group: Does PGS have a steering/advisory committee that helps CU to stay competitive and relevant? In the next 3 – 5 years there will be more jobs than graduating students. Institutions need to be cutting edge to meet the needs of the market.

Student Evaluation Comments and Concerns

- Timeliness of feedback from faculty members--students consistently commented that faculty members did not grade papers in a timely

manner; often, notes were made about several weeks passing before students would get grades or feedback

- Timeliness of e-mail responses from faculty members; having to wait multiple days
- Quality of feedback from faculty members--students consistently commented that faculty members gave very little or very little useful or meaningful feedback on papers, in discussion forums, or on assignments that help students improve their writing, critical thinking, or ability to conceptualize or express their ideas
- Lack of online presence for online faculty members—not participating in discussion forums and not adding anything of value over and above the course assignments and text—students feel as if they are teaching themselves
- Palpable frustration by students concerning mismatching information in Moodle compared to the course guide/syllabus--drop box (Turnitin) dates that do not match assignment dates exemplified this concern
- Frustration with same type of assignments over and over again throughout the program with no changing or development in classes throughout program—seems like classes are built in isolation, not as a cogent whole
- Ethics course taught like a Sunday school class instead of as business ethics course by people who deal with real ethical issues
- Quality of students; students notice when at-risk or under-prepared students are allowed to continue in classes within the program
- PLTs, PLTs, PLTs ... frustration over, anxiety about, and anger toward the former PGS PLT model were expressed over and over again. Student comments focused on free rider and social loafer effects; lack of accountability for those (free rider or social loafers) who did not contribute; lack of right kind or type of group assignment for group projects (assigning papers or other work that could be done by one person but then dividing it up among 3-5 people); and the lack of congruence between PLT assignments and stated objectives and the type of problems solved in teams at work in practical industry settings.
- Positive comments were also noted and these focused on
 - Faculty subject matter knowledge and practical business or management application
 - Faculty who grade papers in a timely manner and provide detailed feedback on assignments are handsomely rewarded with glowing comments from students
 - Faculty who treat students as “first among equals” in the classroom environment, bend a little, provide some flexibility, and understand the vagaries of being a student are also noted for distinction in feedback from students; in short, faculty who

either understand or just apply adult learning principles get high marks from students

- Authentic assessment and case study analysis of real problems is desired and appreciated by students in both business programs

- c. **Bachelor of Science in Management:** The BSM program was reviewed concomitantly with the BSBA program. The two programs share nine courses (out of 14 in the BSM program and out of 15 in the BSBA, 65% and 60%, respectively). Consequently, the only differences in the two programs in terms of feedback was in individual courses that differ between the two. No individual course changes requiring Academic Council or Faculty Senate review were made to this program in the last year. Specific course-level changes to assignments, texts, objectives, and topics will be addressed within PGS' new curriculum review process and are not mentioned here. The assessment comments summarized above for the BSBA program from faculty and students apply to this program as well.
- d. **MA in Education:** The MAED program was reviewed in early 2016 through feedback gained from a PGS faculty focus group, student end-of-course evaluations for the last three years, and graduate/alumni surveys. The majority of feedback on the program indicated a need for PGS to stay current in addressing needs within the educational systems MAED students face. With changing standards, updated policy directions, new technology, etc. there are many areas that the MAED classes address in the curriculum that may change quickly in light of educational policy revisions, legislation, etc. These changes would need to be included in working through the PGS curriculum revision cycle. Ensuring that textbooks and other course materials are updated will be important to ensuring the ongoing success of the MAED program. Including outside professional perspectives may also be important to the curriculum development process.

Proposed changes to the program include:

- Ensure that the curriculum remains updated – this goal can be achieved through the work of the Curriculum Committee as it reviews courses and works with SMEs.
- Formation of an external Advisory Council to assist PGS in making curricular changes in keeping with professional and accreditation standards.

- Review the cycle of course revision to ensure that courses are as accurate as possible in areas with rapidly changing professional contexts and policy (for example, educational technology, diversity).
- Work with faculty to make sure that classes are presented accurately and updated in Moodle, and that students receive more consistent feedback on their papers.

3) Review of Individual Courses:

a. **Course Evaluations:** each course at PGS is reviewed using a web-based evaluation software that allows students to provide feedback on the course professor and course content. A summary of the quantitative feedback is provided below to present data on the assignments, materials, and faculty. Average scores are presented for each category, based on a 5-point scale comparing the 2014/15 academic year with the 2015/16 academic year.

Blue = 2014/15 academic year

Pink = 2015/16 academic year

Table 2: Student End-of-Course Feedback on Materials & Assignments

Texts and materials provided adequate information	Assignments helped me engage in the subject matter	Activities helped me apply theoretical knowledge to real life problems	Materials improved my knowledge and understanding of this subject matter	Assignments and activities improved my communication skills	Assignments and activities improved my critical thinking skills	Group assignments and activities improved my interpersonal skills
4.40	4.39	4.35	4.42	4.18	4.32	4.09
4.38	4.38	4.35	4.40	4.16	4.33	4.04

(1= Strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= undecided, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree)

Review: In general, the scores remained stable between the 2014/15 and the 2015/16 academic years. Feedback on textbooks and course materials shows that students largely feel they are learning the appropriate information and knowledge related to their program. The course assignment feedback presented a wider range of scores, with lower scores reported in the areas of group assignments and communication skills.

Action Steps: Ongoing curricular changes to the group learning requirements at PGS should help students to make more meaning of their group assignments and grow in their interpersonal skills. Helping students to improve their communication skills will require a more developmental curricular approach. For example, revisions are in process in the bachelor’s degree programs to update the ENG-119 and COM-211 courses to have students focus more time on developing their writing and oral presentation skills using a sequential learning approach. Students will write a paper in ENG-119 that will become the basis for their COM-211 presentations, allowing students to spend more time in the COM class thinking about communicating existing content, rather than developing new content. This is one example of the type of curricular change that can be guided by the ongoing work of the curriculum committee.

Table 3: Student End-of-Course Feedback on Faculty

Faculty member was prepared for class.	It was clear to me that the faculty member had knowledge of the subject area	Faculty member incorporated biblical principles into the course	Provided clear expectations regarding assignments and graded outcomes	Provided timely and relevant feedback	Facilitated the application of theory to life and work setting	Faculty member demonstrated an enthusiasm about the subject and teaching	Faculty member created an environment that encouraged my participation	Faculty member was helpful and responsive to students	Use of APA
4.76	4.79	4.64	4.52	4.47	4.52	4.72	4.64	4.66	4.63
4.71	4.72	4.61	4.46	4.45	4.49	4.65	4.62	4.62	4.64

(1= None, 2= little, 3= some, 4= most, 5= all)

Review: In general, the scores remained similar between the 2014/15 and the 2015/16 academic years. Faculty scored highest in the areas of preparation for class, knowledge of the subject area, and enthusiasm about the subject area. The lower scores focused on faculty providing timely and relevant feedback, as well as setting clear expectations for assignments and outcomes.

Action Steps: Establishing clear expectations for assignments and outcomes involves having clearly written syllabi and faculty guides, combined with faculty communicating with students. The curriculum committee will work to make the syllabi and faculty guides present the outcomes more clearly. The need for faculty to present students with timely and relevant feedback on assignments will be a point of emphasis in the 2016/17 faculty professional development plans.

- b. **Curriculum Development:** During the early part of 2016 a review of the curriculum development process at PGS resulted in a number of major changes to the process. These changes seek to address an overarching gap in the assessment process and curricular revisions. Previously the feedback gained from students and faculty course evaluations was not consistently applied in shaping curricular revisions. As a result, assessment data gathered at PGS was largely disconnected from improving the quality of curriculum and improving student learning.

In April 2016 a newly-formed PGS Curriculum Committee began work to address the issues related to assessment and improving the quality of curriculum. Beginning with two courses, IDS-302 (Principles of Self-Management) and MGT-534 (Operations and Quality Outcomes Management), the committee initiated a new development process. The Committee consists of the Director of Curriculum, the Associate Dean of Business, the Associate Dean of Human Services, Curriculum Specialists, Instructional Designers, and the faculty member subject matter expert.

A key change in this process involves reviewing end-of-course student and faculty evaluations and identifying major themes to address to improve course quality. In some cases, this will involve a major course revision based on course feedback, while in other cases the changes will be minor. The Committee will continue to develop its processes for integrating assessment data into curricular improvement during the 2016-17 year.

CU Assessment Committee work & Implications for PGS

In April 2016 the CU Assessment Committee approved significant revisions to the assessment of student learning outcomes across the University. PGS was represented on this Committee by the Associate Dean of Human Services. The Committee worked to approve a set of student learning outcomes that could be implemented across all Principal Academic Units (PAUs) at the university. The goal was to provide a framework for assessing student learning that is manageable and sustainable.

The Committee based its work on the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), a learning-centered framework for assessment that has been used nationwide at over 400 schools since 2011. After reviewing the five areas presented by the DQP the Committee approved the following five CU-specific learning domains for all students at the university:

I. Specialized Knowledge

Cornerstone students will demonstrate knowledge of and proficiency in the terminology, theories, concepts, practices, and skills specific to their field of study.

II. Applied Knowledge and Collaborative Learning

Cornerstone students will exhibit competency in applying their knowledge to address real-life problems through both individual and group effort.

III. Broad and Integrative Knowledge

Cornerstone students will demonstrate their ability to integrate relevant areas of knowledge from multiple fields of study (e.g., the humanities, arts, theology, sciences and social sciences).

IV. Civic & Global Engagement

Cornerstone students will demonstrate intercultural competence in addressing civic, social, environmental and economic issues.

V. Biblical Worldview Integration and Action.

Cornerstone students will be able to articulate a Christ-centered worldview and its personal, professional, and communal embodiment through Christian virtues.

Integrating these five domains of student learning at PGS will be a main emphasis for assessment work in the 2016-17 academic year. The process will include significant input from PGS faculty and review by the PGS Academic Council to ensure that these learning goals fit with the mission of PGS.

The learning goals were presented for initial discussion at the May 11, 2016 PGS Academic Council meeting, and faculty consultation will begin over the summer and into the fall semester. The Academic Council is expected to formally review the learning objectives later in the fall 2016 semester. This process will bring PGS into alignment with the other PAUs at the university. It will ensure that the assessment of student learning at PGS is consistent in its focus and direction, in keeping with the other academic units at the university. This will achieve the goal of using a shared framework and language of assessment at the institution.

The PGS Curriculum Committee will be responsible for integrating the five learning goals into individual courses. This process will include working with the subject matter experts and instructional designers to map the learning goals across each degree program, and to ensure students are learning within a structured, developmental framework.

Assessment Planning for 2016-17

The following assessment initiatives and projects are planned for the 2016-17 year:

- a. Refining the curricular review process (PGS Curriculum Committee) including the integration of the five learning outcomes
- b. Development of assessment maps for student learning in each PGS degree program
- c. Consultation with PGS faculty regarding the five main learning outcomes approved by the CU Assessment Committee
- d. PGS Academic Council review of the five learning outcomes approved by the CU Assessment Committee
- e. Program review for the bachelor's degree in psychology, MA TESOL, and MS in management programs

Appendix C: Grand Rapids Theological Seminary – Annual Report

Grand Rapids Theological Seminary Assessment Report: 2015-2016

2015-2016 Activities- The academic year 2015-2016 was given to a range of assessment projects and activities. The agenda was robust and the faculty completed most of the intended projects. Those not completed will be added to the agenda for 2016-2017 and tracked to completion. A number of new assessment projects were launched and completed, assessment project reporting instruments were modestly updated, and some corrective action was implemented based on the findings of previous assessment projects. The following outlines projects and activities for 2015-2016.

1. ***Exegetical Project-*** The Bible faculty (i.e., Hilber and Greer) developed a comparative assessment project in 2015-16 for implementation in Fall 2016. Specifically, the division is assessing student achievement in the core outcome related to basic exegetical/hermeneutical competency within the BBL-501 Biblical Hermeneutics course. The project is designed to compare student achievement in the intended outcomes of the course for both the on-ground and online offerings of the course. This approach will allow us to assess the achievement of the student outcomes of the course and to do so across the range of modes of delivery.
2. ***Theological Competency Project*** - The theology division (Wittmer and Bennett) enacted a comparative assessment project to assess student achievement of the intended student learning outcomes in theological competency for traditional residential students (i.e., Master of Divinity and Master of Arts/Christian Formation), online students, and residential counseling students. A sample of the “forgiveness” papers from THE641 Systematic Theology III (on-ground and online) and THE-550 Theology for Counseling (on-ground) were scored using an assessment rubric. The project utilized the “forgiveness” papers since these papers represent the capstone assignment for the systematic theology sequence for both on-ground and online offerings. The project report includes findings and recommendations.
3. ***Cultural Intelligence and Cultural Exegesis Project-*** The ministries division (Bustrum and McKeague) enacted a comparative assessment project associated with the core outcome related to cultural intelligence and cultural exegesis. The project was designed in relation to the MIN-560 Global Impact course which is offered on-ground (Bustrum/McKeague) and online (McKeague). The project report includes findings and recommendations.
4. ***Counseling Project: Student Learning Outcomes-*** As we prepare to pursue CACREP accreditation for the MA Counseling program, the counseling division decided to focus this year’s assessment project on comparing the CACREP Core Area Standards with the GRTS Learning Outcomes for the MA Counseling degree to determine how we might need to change our program learning outcomes to satisfy the expectations/interests of both State of Michigan (licensure requirements) and CACREP (professional accreditation requirements). We found that except for some points in Standard 1 and point (h) in Standard 6, all of the CACREP Standards are covered

in our core required courses and within our existing student learning outcomes. The project was completed, a final report written, and the report identifies a couple of needed changes.

5. **MA Counseling Alumni Survey-** Kram worked with the counseling division to refine and administer the MA Counseling Alumni Survey during the 15-16 academic year. The administration of the survey is complete. A total of seventy-one graduates of the program completed the online survey which is a credible response rate. From the survey we learned that 96% of the graduates of the program are employed. Of the respondents, 40% are engaged in private practice professional counseling while 33% work in a counseling agency. The findings of the survey will be presented to the GRTS faculty in Fall 2016.
6. **Assessment Report Template-** As a means to better document the “closing of the loop” in the work of assessment, a section was developed and added to the Assessment Project Report Template. This final section will be completed once the suggested actions have been fully implemented. The Academic Dean will add prior year assessment projects to divisional meeting agendas as a means to foster discussions about the implementation of the recommendations, and the project report will be updated by the assessment project team once these corrective actions are implemented.
7. **Mid-point and Exit Assessment Report-** Kram facilitated the administration of the mid-point and exit assessments during fall 2015 and spring 2016. The results of these processes are reported below:

Each semester we conduct the Mid-point Assessment and Exit Assessment processes. The Mid-point Assessment usually occurs upon completion of the halfway point of the degree program. The Exit Assessment usually occurs upon completion of Ministry Residency 3 or Internship 1 (if applicable) and the last semester or two of the degree program.

The evaluative process is initiated by the academic office and engages the student along with the student’s academic advisor, academic dean, associate dean, ministry mentor and/or practicum or internship supervisor, and the director of ministry residencies in a review of the student’s learning portfolio. Specifically, the team evaluates progress in readiness for ministry in relation to disciplinary knowledge and skill (academic performance), faith commitment and personal maturity (Christian character), and progress made in attaining the student learning outcomes associated with the specific academic program (learning, development, and vocational readiness where applicable).

The evaluative process is intended to be developmental, not punitive. The process and the judgment do not typically have direct implications for the completion of degree at GRTS, but rather provide GRTS an opportunity to speak into students’ lives, educational goals, and vocational aspirations.

At the conclusion of the review process, one of three judgments is rendered by the review team and presented to individual students in written form. The options include: 1) Affirm progress in

readiness for ministry, 2) Affirm progress in readiness for ministry with reservation, 3) Do not affirm progress in readiness for ministry. Typically, judgments 2 and 3 are accompanied with a face-to-face meeting to develop an action plan that will foster additional growth and development.

Fall 2015	Mid-Point Assessment	55
Fall 2015	Exit Assessment	13
Spring 2016	Mid-Point Assessment	16
Spring 2016	Exit Assessment	49

Of the 71 students that completed the mid-point assessment process in the 2015-16 academic year, 67 students (94%) were granted “Affirm progress in readiness for ministry” and 4 students (6%) were granted “Affirm progress in readiness for ministry with reservation.” Of the 62 students that completed the exit assessment process in the 2015-16 academic year, 62 students (100%) were granted “Affirm progress in readiness for ministry.”