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Section 1 Committee Activities

Section 1.1-Committee members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renee Kaufman (Communication)</th>
<th>Kris Rees (Political Science)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Kim (Fine Arts)</td>
<td>Beth Trammel (Psychology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Perkins (English)</td>
<td>Christine Nemcik (History, Phil. &amp; World Languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Raposo (Music)</td>
<td>Wazir Mohamad (Sociology, Anthro. &amp; Geography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengie Parker (Criminal Justice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1.2- Recommendations from AY2014-2015:
1. Request Dean Alexander to bring in someone like Barbara Walvoord or Susan Hatfield to do an assessment workshops.
   - This recommendation was not implemented due to the HSSAC having six (6) new members. The committee and the chair felt that it would be more productive to allow the new committee members a chance to assimilate to their assessment responsible before exposing them to external consultants who may further confuse the new members.

2. I suggest that next year’s committee revise the reflection questions on the new reporting form to include a place for listing last year’s action steps and this year’s progress on achieving those (or revising) them.
   - The committee members were not sure if the assessment summary form needed to be revised. This conclusion may have been the result of the addition of so many new assessment coordinators. This recommendation will be carried forward to the next academic year because the summary form will need to be revised in order to present the disaggregated data analysis.

3. In connection with improving assessment, it would probably be valuable for all the assessment coordinators (who will all be on the committee) to review each other’s reports.
   - This recommendation was implemented. The members of the HSS Assessment committee examined reports for various HSS programs in order to better understand the assessment methods being used in other departments.
Section 1.3- Committee Activities:
During the AY2015-2016, the HSS Assessment Committee (HSSAC) conducted several noteworthy programs and revisions. A brief description of each activity is listed below.

Professional Development for committee members:
- This year, none of the HSS Committee members attended the IUPUI Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. In the past this conference was used to enhance the professional development of HSS assessment committee members. It is anticipated that this conference will be used for professional development in the future (See recommendations).

Professional Development for faculty members:
- HSS Assessment Committee AGILE Workshop (10-29-15).
  - The committee conducted a general workshop for all HSS faculty designed to present assessment findings to the HSS faculty members. The AGILE workshop was also designed to illustrate how the assessment committee members analyze and disseminate assessment data submitted by faculty. Unfortunately, only one faculty member attended the workshop.

HSS Assessment Committee Activities:
- HSS Assessment Review (2015-2016)
  - HSS committee members were tasked with completing a full review of their respective assessment procedures. This review contained multiple dimensions of the assessment processes for each program. Additionally, the assessment review included a Meta-assessment rating of the programs’ assessment development. The assessment review will be posted in the HSS Assessment archive located in Canvas.
  - Revised data Collection procedures.
    - Each program in HSS revised its data collection procedures to include General Education courses. Assessment coordinators worked in conjunction with the Center for Teaching and Learning to build assessment tools and data collection procedures into the Canvas Learning Management System. Assessment data, in the future, will be stored in the HSS assessment archive in Canvas.
- The HSS assessment committee has recovered the HSS assessment archive from the Oncourse LMS and will restructure the archive in the Canvas LMS. All data, reports and meeting minutes will be archived in Canvas in the future.
- New documentation procedures (Final assessment meeting- Minutes)
  - The HSS assessment committee implemented new procedures for documenting assessment-based program discussions and changes. Each program now dedicates the final faculty meeting of the academic year to discussing assessment. The program decisions made are documented in the meeting minutes and will be archived in the HSS assessment archives found in Canvas.

The HSS assessment committee will be losing Renee Kaufman next year due to her accepting a position at another university. The committee will be seeking to fill this position as soon as possible.
Section-2  Program Reports

Section 2.1- Music
Action steps generated from 2014-2015 assessment:

1. Revisit the curriculum map to specify and clarify points of introduction, assessment and reinforcement of the various PLO components.
2. Work with the new aural skills instructor this coming year to develop measurement tools for use in the Sight Singing and Aural Perception classes, so we can assess the aural components of PLO #1.
3. Work with the applied lesson instructors to firm up understanding of the syllabus and assessment form, so we can have a more common set of definitions for student achievement in lessons.

Assessment results for 2015-2016:

- Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 75% of the students scoring 75% on the assessment. PLO1: **Target was met** (mean grade 85%, n=1)

- Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 75% of the students scoring 85% on the assessment. PLO2: **Target was not met** (mean grade 80%, n=1)

- Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 75% of the students scoring 85% on the assessment. PLO3: **Target was not met** (mean grade 80%, n=1)

- Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 75% of the students scoring 75% on the assessment. PLO4: **Target was met** (100%, n=1 met proficiency target)

Data disaggregation procedures were developed but not implemented in time for the data collection. Data disaggregation will begin in the Fall of 2016.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Revisit the assessment plans within the music theory course cycle to find other points of measurement that are more specific to the various components behind music theory study. (PLO #1)
2. Develop measurement tools for use in the Sight Singing and Aural Perception classes, so we can assess the aural components of PLO #1.
3. Work with the applied lesson instructors to firm up understanding of the syllabus and assessment form, so we can have a more common set of definitions for student achievement in lessons. (PLO #4)
4. Develop improved course activities and learning tools within the History of Music classes, and a more structured approach to research papers in the Capstone course, to improve achievement in music history (PLOs 2 and 3).
Section 2.2- History

Action steps generated from 2014-2015 assessment:

1. Revise the History Program Assessment System to ensure that we are working to best fit our courses to the desired learning outcomes of the program.

2. Work to expose students to a variety of primary and secondary sources materials, and particularly help them to become more conversant with a variety of primary source materials. Help students to discover the abundance of historical monographs and scholarly articles that are so significant to developing historiographical awareness.

3. Press students to make progressive improvements in using source materials, creating sound analysis, and using documentation (footnotes) throughout the semester in order to see greater improvement over the course of assignments.

Assessment results for 2015-2016:

The proficiency targets for History are listed below:

PLO1: **Target was met.**

PLO2: **Target was partially met.** (3 of the 5 students met proficiency)

PLO3: **Target was not met.**

PLO4: **Target was met.**

PLO5: **Target was partially met.**

PLO6: **Target was partially met.** (13/19 students met proficiency)

Data disaggregation procedures were developed but not implemented in time for the data collection. Data disaggregation will begin in the Fall of 2016.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Revise the History Program Assessment System to ensure that we are working to best fit our courses to the desired learning outcomes of the program.

2. Work to expose students to a variety of primary and secondary sources materials, and particularly help them to become more conversant with a variety of primary source materials. Help students to discover the abundance of historical monographs and scholarly articles that are so significant to developing historiographical awareness.

3. Press students to make progressive improvements in using source materials, creating sound analysis, and using documentation (footnotes) throughout the semester in order to see greater improvement over the course of assignments.

Section 2.3- Psychology

Action steps generated from 2014-2015 assessment:

1. Make changes to the exit exam for senior seminar.

2. Figure out exactly how to obtain both direct and indirect measures of each of the program learning objectives.

3. Move toward developing “shells” of online course material to be simply handed off to adjuncts. In doing it this way, we have much more control of the academic integrity of the course.
Assessment results for 2015-2016:

For all objectives, the target goal is to have at least 75% of students achieve scores of 73% or higher (proficient or exceptional). Of all the assignments submitted, 95% of them were either proficient (73%-90%) or exceptional (91%+).

Oral Presentations: Target was met (86% of the students met our target goal).
Writing Expression: Target was met (100% of the students met target goal)
Objective 4: Target was not met for FA2015 (72% of the students met goal)
Target was met for SP16 (80% of students met goal)
Objective 5: Target was met (95% of the students met goal)

Data disaggregation procedures were developed but not implemented in time for the data collection. Data disaggregation will begin in the Fall of 2016.

Action steps for the coming year:
1. We will continue to make adjustments to the course shell for adjuncts as well.
2. Our assessment plan next year will include several courses (upper level) that focus on student writing/communication.
3. Possibly adding additional oral assessments in the future, since this appears to be a stronger avenue for students.
4. Continue to advise students to complete the P211 Methods of Experimental Psychology course BEFORE taking most of the 300 and 400 level courses available.
5. Need to increase the conscientiousness and study habits of our students. The fact that most also work a lot outside of school makes this an ongoing challenge.
6. Continue to work on creating rubrics that are more closely aligned with our program objectives to clarify assessment, particularly for senior seminar.

Section 2.4- Political Science

Action steps generated from 2014-2015 assessment:
1. Continued class-based and cumulative exams in order to increase student engagement knowledge retention.

Assessment results for 2015-2016:
Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.
Proficiency goal (Indirect measure): 70% of students “Agree” or “Strongly agree” with the PLO-link statement of ability.
PLO1: Target was not met (14.3%, n=1 met proficiency target)
Indirect measure target was met (87.5%, n=7)
PLO2: Target not met (14.3%, n=1 met proficiency target)
Indirect measure target was met (87.5%, n=7)
PLO3: Target not met (14.3%, n=1 met proficiency target)
Indirect measure target was met (87.5%, n=7)
PLO4: Target not met (28.6%, n=2 met proficiency target)
Indirect measure target was met (87.5%, n=7)

Data disaggregation procedures were developed but not implemented in time for the data collection. Data disaggregation will begin in the Fall of 2016.

Action steps for the coming year:
1. Continue and expand the use of quizzes that are directly linked to the program PLOs.
2. Continue and expand the development of evaluation rubrics for course assignments.
3. More rigorous application of the QM rubric to ensure that students are having a consistent educational experience.

Section 2.5 - Fine Arts

Assessment results for 2015-2016:
Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 80% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.

PLO1: Target was met (91.67% met proficiency target)
PLO2: Target was met (82% met proficiency target)
PLO3: Target was not met (86.4% met proficiency target)
PLO4: Target was met (87.5% proficiency target)

Data disaggregation procedures were developed but not implemented in time for the data collection. Data disaggregation will begin in the Fall of 2016.

Action steps for the coming year:
1. Have ALL studio courses incorporate “visual formal analysis” exercise to ensure student achievement in PLO #1 (Terminology) and PLO #2 (Art Criticism)
2. Continue with the changes that were made to the course structure that resulted in an overall higher score in each category compared to last year, and continue offering the course as a twice a week course instead of once a week structure and offer it on campus instead of at Room 912.
3. Continue inviting guest artists to visit the Capstone class to conduct studio visits with the seniors for more experiential learning opportunities which will help students with art criticism and art history by becoming more conversed in being critiqued by professional artists and through learning about more contemporary artists that are influencing people’s work today; having a streamlined exhibition schedule that is publicized at the beginning of each semester and more invited artist lectures that are required for the students would be helpful: this way, we can also assign them to write about their experiences, which will reinforce their ability to utilize the terminology they have learned in the class, which will improve PLO #1’s “Terminology” portion as well as PLO #3’s aim to increase students’ ability to critique works of art in their historical context while incorporating high-impact practices that haven been proven to reinforce learning in a more effective way than just from class exercises alone. In order for this to work, it will be important to have a set calendar at the beginning of each semester. We just created an
exhibition calendar with receptions on Third Thursdays of each month in an effort to make the Fine Arts events schedule more streamlined and organized.

Section 2.6- English

Assessment results for 2015-2016:

**Literature Concentration**
Proficiency goal (Direct measure):
- Intro—av. score of 2.0/4.0
- Reinf.—av. score of 3.0/4.0
- Mastery—av. score of 3.0-3.5/4.0

LC-PLO1: **Target was met** (2.25, 3.05, 3.8)
LC-PLO2: **Target was partially met** (2.25, 2.7, 3.05)
LC-PLO3: **Target was partially met** (2.22, 2.97, 4.0)
LC-PLO4: **Target was met** (2.43, 3.1, 3.6)
LC-PLO5: **Target was partially met** (1.47, 2.72, 3.85)

**Creative Writing Concentration**
Proficiency goal (Direct measure):
- Intro—av. score of 2.0/4.0
- Reinf.—av. score of 3.0/4.0

CW-PLO1: **Target was met** (2.37, 3.27)
CW-PLO2: **Target was partially met** (2.3, 2.94)
CW-PLO3: **Target was met** (2.1, 3.0)
CW-PLO4: **Target was partially met** (2.05, 2.76)
CW-PLO5: **Target was met** (2.85, 3.0)

**Composition Concentration**
Proficiency goal (Direct measure):
- Intro—av. score of 2.0/4.0
- Mastery—av. score of 3.0-3.5/4.0

CC-PLO1: **Target was met** (2.4, 3.8)
CC-PLO2: **Target was met** (2.4, 3.8)
CC-PLO3: **Target was met** (2.4, 3.7)
CC-PLO4: **Target was met** (2.4, 3.8)
CC-PLO5: **Target was met** (2.0, 3.4)

Data disaggregation procedures were developed but not implemented in time for the data collection. Data disaggregation will begin in the Fall of 2016.

Action steps for the coming year:
1. Evidence of student learning was shared with faculty on Friday, May 13, 2016 and a robust discussion followed regarding the meaning of the reported

2. Strengthening mastery of PLOs within the creative writing concentration, beginning in Spring 2017, the English program will offer a senior seminar for the creative writing concentration. This will offer creative writing students an opportunity to demonstrate
mastery of all five learning outcomes and will enable the gathering of more complete assessment data.

3. From the Exit Surveys—The English program will examine ways to better include online students in program activities, as well as better communication and promotion of internships, publication opportunities and related job-oriented activities.

Section 2.7- Sociology, Anthropology, Geography
Proficiency goal: 73-89% correct on assessment measure.

**S-100**
- PLO1: Target was met (77%, met proficiency target)
- PLO2: Target was not met (64.1%, met proficiency target)
- PLO3: Target was not met (65.4%, met proficiency target)
- PLO4: Target was not met (68.4%, met proficiency target)
- PLO5: Target was not met (68.3%, met proficiency target)
- PLO6: Target was not met (57.7%, met proficiency target)
- PLO7: Target was not met (72.2%, met proficiency target)
- PLO8: Target was not met (67.6%, met proficiency target)

**S340**
- PLO1: Target was met (79%, met proficiency target)
- PLO2: Target was met (97%, met proficiency target)
- PLO3: Target was met (76.1%, met proficiency target)
- PLO4: Target was met (88%, met proficiency target)
- PLO5: Target was met (86%, met proficiency target)
- PLO6: Target was met (88%, met proficiency target)

**S217** (Proficiency goal: 60-74% correct on assessment measure)
- PLO1: Target was met (87.6%, met proficiency target)
- PLO2: Target was met (88%, met proficiency target)
- PLO3: Target was met (86%, met proficiency target)
- PLO4: Target was met (88%, met proficiency target)
- PLO5: Target was met (86%, met proficiency target)
- PLO6: Target was met (88%, met proficiency target)

Action steps for the coming year:
1. Analyze and revise the S100 final exam (individual questions, linkages to both General Education and Sociology Learning Outcomes) and target LOs that failed to meet the target range.
2. If additional classroom instruction is found to be necessary in S100 (to supplement the text), meetings will be arranged for the instructors to collaborate on strategies to facilitate learning of specific LOs.
3. Make any necessary changes to the S100 final to better measure both General Education and Sociology Learning Outcomes.
4. Make any necessary changes to the S340 final paper instructions to better measure LO-4.
5. We will develop a rotational schedule of Formative assessment and streamline data collection forms and instruments for both Sociology and Anthropology.
Section 2.8 - Communication

Action steps generated from 2014-2015 assessment:

1. Develop both direct and indirect assessment measures for at least 3 learning outcomes. These should strive to align across the learning curve (at the introductory level and the upper level).
2. Improve communication among all faculty teaching multiple section courses (at least S122 and C205) to ensure that the sections have standard elements incorporated in student learning, and standard assessment instruments applied in all sections.
4. Modify the courses and learning activities. For example,
   a. C205: develop pre-test and post-test
   b. C205: schedule the topic of intercultural communication earlier in the course
   c. C205 and C427: work with appropriate examples to model student analyses
   d. C427: plan targeted work with models of speech outlines
   e. C427: align learning instruments with learning outcomes and rubrics for assessment
6. Submit curriculum changes in September 2015 for approval and, assuming the changes are approved by the end of Spring semester 2016) prepare for their implementation in Fall 2016.

Assessment results for 2015-2016:

Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.
Proficiency goal (Indirect measure): TBD
PLO1: **Target was met** (70%, n=14 met proficiency target)
PLO2: **Target was met** (100%, n=20 met proficiency target)
PLO3: **Target was not met** (40%, n=8 met proficiency target)
PLO4: **Target was met** (70%, n=14 met proficiency target)

Data disaggregation procedures were developed but not implemented in time for the data collection. Data disaggregation will begin in the Fall of 2016.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Continue the discussion of PLO introduction and reinforcement in the classroom as well as sharing and evaluating our course exams and outcomes.
2. Discuss possible changes for the capstone assessment rubric so they clearly reflect what the student should produce.
3. Consider a textbook or guide for students in the capstone class.
Section 2.9- Criminal Justice

Action steps generated from 2014-2015 assessment:

1. Revise data collection procedures for Criminal Justice and Political Science to reflect Semester-based data collection.
2. Develop Common exams for Political Science GenEd courses.
3. Revise the Political Science indirect assessment measure (Exit Survey) to reflect the departmental PLOs.
4. Revise the Political Science direct assessment measure to reflect a Student Learning Portfolio.

Assessment results for 2015-2016:

Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.
Proficiency goal (Indirect measure): achieve a mean score of 70% (k= 14) on each PLO survey index.

PLO1: Target was met (100%, n=4 met proficiency target)
   Indirect measure target was met (\(\bar{X} = 18.54\))

PLO2: Target was not met (50%, n=2 met proficiency target)
   Indirect measure target was met (\(\bar{X} = 17.73\))

PLO3: Target was met (100%, n=4 met proficiency target)
   Indirect measure target was met (\(\bar{X} = 18.52\))

PLO4: Target was met (100%, n=4 met proficiency target)
   Indirect measure target was met (\(\bar{X} = 18.21\))

Upon disaggregating the program assessment data, there was no discontinuity within the PLO attainment the program data. However, there was a discontinuity in the PLO attainment for the P100 General Education course. Transfer students scored higher than Non-transfer students in achieving their statewide outcomes. This difference was both statistically significant and statistically important (p= .024, d= .682).

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Re-aligning faculty to teach courses in their areas of expertise.
2. Revise Common Exams for the program’s general education courses.
3. Make program assessment a required component of the courses.
4. Collect assessment data at the beginning of the P470 Capstone courses rather than the end of the course.

Section 3- Observations and Recommendations

Section 3.1- Assessment Observations and Trends

The culture of assessment at IU East continues to develop. The HSS assessment committee had six new members added in AY2015-2016 and the new committee members have embraced the culture of assessment well. The assessment review was an invaluable tool for helping the new committee members identify shortcomings in their respective assessment plans. Most of the assessment coordinators have proven themselves to be highly dedicated to the effective assessment of their programs.
Some HSS programs have assessment procedures that are more refined than others. Political Science, English, Communication, Psychology, Fine Arts and Criminal Justice have assessment procedures that are robust and sustainable. The goal of the HSS assessment committee chair will be to refine the remaining three (3) programs. To be fair, the three less-robust assessment programs have suffered from a high degree of turnover which has contributed to a slower rate of evolution.

The AY2015-2016 data revealed that there are a few programs that are having minor issues with data reduction. The problem is not the collection of too much data but rather the inefficient presentation of data. This will become more of an issue once program coordinators begin disaggregating the assessment data. It is possible to address this issue through individual consultation with the assessment coordinators or through a committee training seminar.

Section 3.2- Goals and Recommendations for AY2016-2017

The HSS assessment committee goals for AY2016-2017 are as follows:
1. Revise the assessment summary form to include the Outcome Continuity (data disaggregation) data.
2. Implement the revised General Education data collection and analysis plan for HSS.
3. Refine the data presentation for the HSS assessment programs to increase the efficient presentation of assessment data.
4. Increase the use of indirect assessment instruments.

The HSS assessment committee chair’s recommendation for AY2016-2017 are as follows:
1. Implement an IUPUI Assessment Institute rotation for the HSS assessment committee whereby each year 3 committee members are sent to the conference. Priority would be giving to new committee members but the attendance rotation would also allow existing committee members to stay abreast of new assessment methods.
2. Provide funding for an HSSAC team-building activity such as a retreat or committee barbeque.