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Chair, HSS Assessment Committee (HSSAC)
*Note: Italic font denotes work copied from program report.

Section-1 Committee Activities

Section 1.1-Committee members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natalia Rybas (Communication)</th>
<th>Kris Rees (Political Science and International Studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ann Kim (Fine Arts)</td>
<td>Beth Trammel (Psychology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Perkins (English)</td>
<td>Justin Carrol (History, Phil. &amp; World Languages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Raposo (Music)</td>
<td>Denise Bullock (Sociology, Anthro. &amp; Geography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mengie Parker (Criminal Justice)</td>
<td>Amanda Kraha (BGS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianne Moneypenny (Spanish)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1.2- Recommendations from AY2015-2016:
The HSS assessment committee goals for AY2016-2017 were as follows:

1. Revise the assessment summary form to include the Outcome Continuity (data disaggregation) data.
   - The HSSAC implemented data disaggregation requirements for all General Education (GenEd) and program assessments. The Spring workshop focused on data structure, disaggregation techniques and implicit bias testing. Additionally, the Office of Institutional Research agreed to assist with data analysis for any HSS program that requested assistance.
   - GenEd courses disaggregated data by Course Delivery. Data were tested to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in GenEd competency attainment between seated and online students.
   - Program assessment data were disaggregated and tested for any statistically significant differences in Program Learning Outcome (PLO) attainment between transfer students and students who were IU East natives.

2. Implement the revised General Education data collection and analysis plan for HSS.
   - The HSSAC implemented a new GenEd data collection rotation designed to collect data from all GenEd competencies served by the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. The new rotation ensures that a full range of GenEd data will be available to the GenEd Assessment Committee (GEAC) each academic year.

3. Refine the data presentation for the HSS assessment programs to increase the efficient presentation of assessment data.
   - A new GenEd reporting form and Continuity Table were adopted to meet this goal.
4. Increase the use of indirect assessment instruments.
   - This goal is still undergoing development. More programs are incorporating indirect assessment measures but HSS does not have 100% compliance.

5. Implemented the HSS Assessment Champion Award.
   - This award is given to the HSS faculty member who most personifies the culture of assessment here at IU East. Award candidates must be nominated by faculty and elected to receive the award by the HSS department chairs.

6. The HSS assessment committee chair’s recommendation for AY2016-2017 were as follows:

   A. Implement an IUPUI Assessment Institute rotation for the HSS assessment 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.
   - Five members of the assessment committee attended the IUPUI Assessment Institute in 2016.

   B. Provide funding for an HSSAC team-building activity such as a retreat or committee barbeque.
   - The assessment committee was unable to establish any team-building activities in the 2016-2017 academic year due primarily to the varying schedules of the committee members.

Section 1.3- Committee Activities:
During the AY2016-2017, 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:
   - As previously stated, five of the HSS Committee members attended the IUPUI Assessment Institute in Indianapolis. This conference is the primary means through which to enhance the professional development of HSS assessment committee members. It is anticipated that this conference will continue be used for professional development in the future.

   - HSS Assessment Committee Fall Workshop.
     - The committee conducted a general workshop on data disaggregation and implicit bias testing. While the workshop was opened to all faculty, only HSSAC members attended. Topic areas included: Data structure, data disaggregation, significance testing, implicit bias and documentation.

   - HSS Assessment Committee Spring Workshop.
The committee conducted a Spring workshop on using e-portfolios for assessment. This workshop was conducted by Dr. Beth Trammel and was open to all faculty. The topics included e-portfolios, student learning, LMS tool, techniques and documentation.

Documentation procedures:
- The HSS assessment committee continued its practice of documenting all assessment activities in the HSS assessment archives found in Canvas.

The HSS assessment committee will again be experiencing personnel changes in the 2017-2018 year. New members from Communication Studies and the HSS Writing Center will be joining the committee.

Section 2 Program Reports

Section 2.1- Music
Action steps generated from 2015-2016 assessment:

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).

Assessment results for 2016-2017:
- Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 75% of the students achieving Mastery.

  PLO1: Target was not met (60% achieved mastery)
  PLO2: Target was met (100% achieved mastery)
  PLO3: Target was met (91% achieved mastery)
  PLO4: Target was met (100% achieved mastery)

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Revisit the assessment plans within the music theory course cycle to establish more continuity and consistent learning to better prepare student success. (PLO#1)
2. Revisit and refine the measurement tools for use in the Sight Singing and Aural Perception classes, so we can better assess the aural components of PLO#1.
3. Work with the applied lesson instructors to set stronger expectations students, 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 2015-2016 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 2016-2017:

The proficiency targets for History are listed below:

- PLO1: Unable to determine (N=8).
- PLO2: Unable to determine (N=14).
- PLO3: Unable to determine (No data submitted).
- PLO4: Unable to determine (No data submitted).
- PLO5: Unable to determine (No data submitted).

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Over the last several years, we became aware that our assessment wasn’t creating the vibrant or robust data to adequately assess our PLOs. When we started this process, we were told that we could take a sampling of students per course, but as our understanding of assessment became more robust and formal, we learned that wasn’t the case. As such, we created an assessment program that collects material from all of the students in our courses – shared exams, research papers, and a capstone. Likewise, we transitioned to a portfolio model for the program; the students collect material from multiple courses and turn it in during their capstone experience. This will go into effect in Fall 2017.

2. In order to solid a stronger understanding of historical material, primary source analysis, research and writing, etc., we created shared mid-terms and final exams, and we implicated a final cumulative exam that students have to pass in the captive. Likewise, we now require research papers in all of our 300/400 level courses; this will ensure that students will always engage academic research and writing. This will go into effect in Fall 2017.
3. Finally, as a way of fostering students with a clear understanding of what a history degree can do for them, and, as a result, better tailor and take ownership of their academic career, we created a series of assignments in our HIST-H217: Methods course and our HIST-J495 designed to foster job-related skills like CV writing, or resume writing, or teaching philosophy development, or how to establish a research agenda. This will go into effect in Fall 2017.

Section 2.3- Psychology

Action steps generated from 2015-2016 assessment:
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.

Assessment results for 2016-2017:
For all objectives, the target goal is to have at least 75% of students achieve scores of 70% or higher (proficient or exceptional).

Objective 1: **Target was not met** (62.22% of the students met our target goal).
Objective 2: **Target was met** (75% of the students met target goal)
Objective 3: **Target was met** (84.5% of the students met goal)
Objective 4: **Target was met** (96.26% of students met goal)
Objective 5: **Target was met** (85% of the students met goal)
Objective 6: **Target was met** (90% of the students met goal)

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.

Action steps for the coming year:
1. **Continue to implement consistent rubrics to give a clearer picture of our students strengths and areas of need.**
2. **Continue to analyze the exit exam, but more importantly emphasis critical aspects of psychology within every course to help improve scores on the exit exam (and the students’ overall knowledge of psychology).**
3. **Train each faculty member to incorporate assessment effectively and meaningfully in our courses.**
Action steps generated from 2015-2016 assessment:

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.

Assessment results for 2016-2017:

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** (36%, n=5 met proficiency target)
      **Indirect measure target was met** (100%, n=14)

PLO2: **Target not met** (21%, n=3 met proficiency target)
      **Indirect measure target was met** (100%, n=14)

PLO3: **Target not met** (36%, n=5 met proficiency target)
      **Indirect measure target was met** (100%, n=14)

PLO4: **Target not met** (57%, n=8 met proficiency target)
      **Indirect measure target was met** (100%, n=14)

*Data disaggregation was completed but no significance tests were reported.
Disaggregation data suggested that Transfer students performed lower than IU East Native students did. However, without the accompanying significance tests it is impossible to know whether those results occurred by chance.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. **Integration of signature assignments from each upper division course into Senior Seminar portfolio. Creation of an assessment-oriented rubric for these assignments, so that we can include procedural assessment data into future program evaluations.**

2. **Revise senior exit exam in early Fall 2017, per Spring Meeting action plan, including approval of revised PLOs. Take into account the problem areas identified in the senior seminar data reporting document.**

3. **Build review modules in the Senior Seminar course that reinforce the material that students covered in previous courses, introduce the learning outcomes that they will be assessed on in their revised assignment, and review some of the materials they will see in their post-test.**

4. **Continued and expanded development of evaluation rubrics for course assignments (including discussion posts, journal entries, and course papers) that are clearly and explicitly linked to appropriate PLOs (whether via PLO-linked CourseLOs, or to PLOs directly). Consider linking to Mastery Paths on Canvas.**

5. **More rigorous application of the QM rubric to all online classes, to ensure that students are receiving a consistent educational experience within the program. Raising the QM credentials of all TT POLS faculty to QM Certified Reviewer level or higher. Work with all program faculty to harmonize look-and-feel**
between courses (and to coordinate content where possible, especially at the introductory level).

6. Continued and expanded use of quizzes (for credit and not for credit) with questions directly linked to PLOs in intro and upper division classes. This is expected to improve student engagement with, and retention of, (PLO-linked) course material, and may help provide objective indicators of student performance that would close the gap between direct and indirect evaluations.

Section 2.5- Fine Arts
Action steps generated from 2015-2016 assessment:

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.

Assessment results for 2016-2017:

Proficiency goal (Direct measure): An average score of 3/4 (75%) in the “Proficiency” range.

PLO1: **Target was met** (3.24 average, n= 19)
PLO2: **Target was met** (3.15 average, n= 19)
PLO3: **Target was not met** (2.9 average, n= 5)

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.
Action steps for the coming year:

1. More collaboration among instructors to improve and embed experiential learning into our curricula such as group field trips, domestic travel courses, guest artists, visiting artist demos and workshops, etc.

2. More strategic programming in terms of the exhibition calendar, alignment among exhibitions with course curricula, and regular/streamlined events that are well-promoted, organized, and announced in advance. Gallery schedules need to be provided to the students at the beginning of the academic year.

3. Organize a meeting with our adjunct faculty that teach 2+ courses/semester to get feedback about ways in which we can improve our instruction and student learning.

Section 2.6- English

Assessment results for 2016-2017:

**Literature Concentration** (Proficiency goal 60% Achieving Mastery)

PLO1: Literary Interpretation and Textual Analysis:

- **Direct Target was met** (63% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (90% met proficiency target)

Discontinuity- IUE Native students scored statistically higher that Transfer students (p= .001, d= 1.03).

PLO2: Critical Approaches:

- **Direct Target was met** (71% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (81% met proficiency target)

Discontinuity- IUE Native students scored statistically higher that Transfer students (p= .004, d= 0.80).

PLO3: Cultural and Historical Contexts:

- **Direct Target was met** (73% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (81% met proficiency target)

Discontinuity- IUE Native students scored statistically higher that Transfer students (p= .041, d= 0.56).

PLO4: Effective Writing:

- **Direct Target was met** (74% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (90% met proficiency target)

Discontinuity- IUE Native students scored statistically higher that Transfer students (p= .002, d= 0.87).

PLO5: Information Literacy:

- **Direct Target was met** (73% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (90% met proficiency target)

Discontinuity- IUE Native students scored statistically higher that Transfer students (p= .009, d= 0.71).
**Technical and Professional Writing Concentration** (Proficiency goal: 60% Mastery)

PLO1: Audience and Purpose:
- **Direct Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
  No Discontinuity

PLO2: Organization and Format:
- **Direct Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
  No Discontinuity

PLO3: Communication Strategies:
- **Direct Target was met** (92% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
  No Discontinuity

PLO4: Conventions:
- **Direct Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
  No Discontinuity

PLO5: Information Literacy:
- **Direct Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
- **Indirect Target was met** (100% met proficiency target)
  No Discontinuity

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Information literacy, PLO #5, in both literature and technical and professional writing concentrations, returned softer scores in comparison with other PLOs, overall. Increased attention will be given to classroom effectiveness/practices in conveying concepts as well as clarifying what constitutes evidence of learning in this area.

2. Discontinuity between native and transfer students will be addressed in literature courses for all PLOs, beginning with PLO #5 in the next academic year, by including review of fundamental concepts, as faculty deem necessary, that transfer students may have not learned prior to coming to IU East or may have not retained.

3. Revisions will be made to quantitative sections of exit survey (indirect measure) in order to better align questions with concentration PLOs.

Section 2.7- Sociology, Anthropology, Geography

Action steps generated from 2015-2016 assessment:

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.

Proficiency goal: 73-89% correct on assessment measure.

The Sociology program only had one (1) student graduate this year. The summative assessment data for the specific program PLOs were not assessed due to their not being any assessment tools for the outcomes scheduled to be measured. The summative assessment data provided was for “presentation of the final capstone paper” (Sociology Assessment Report, p.3). The graduating student met the portfolio presentation grade with a score of 78% Proficiency. No data disaggregation was possible for the Summative assessment and no data disaggregation was reported for the formative assessment. The remaining assessment data reported was for the formative evaluation not the summative evaluation.

**S-100** (Proficiency goal: 73% or higher)
- PLO1a: **Target was met** (89%, met proficiency target)
- PLO2a: **Target was not met** (68%, met proficiency target)
- PLO2c: **Target was met** (80%, met proficiency target)
- PLO3a: **Target was met** (82%, met proficiency target)
- PLO3e: **Target was met** (84%, met proficiency target)
- PLO4a: **Target was not met** (70%, met proficiency target)
- PLO5a: **Target was met** (79%, met proficiency target)
- PLO6a: **Target was met** (88%, met proficiency target)

**S217** (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
- PLO1e: **Target was not met** (68%, met proficiency target)
- PLO1f: **Target was met** (73%, met proficiency target)
- PLO1g: **Target was met** (75%, met proficiency target)

**S320** (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
- PLO2c: **Target was met** (72%, met proficiency target)

**S413** (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
- PLO1f: **Target was met** (80%, met proficiency target)
- PLO1g: **Target was not met** (59%, met proficiency target)
- PLO4d: **Target was met** (100%, met proficiency target)

**S410Q** (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
- PLO1f: **Target was met** (81%, met proficiency target)
- PLO1g: **Target was not met** (69%, met proficiency target)
- PLO4b: **Target was met** (75%, met proficiency target)
- PLO4d: **Target was met** (81%, met proficiency target)
A103 (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
PLO3e: Target was met (78%, met proficiency target)
PLO3f: Target was met (78%, met proficiency target)

A104 (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
PLO3e: Target was met (85%, met proficiency target)
PLO3f: Target was met (85%, met proficiency target)

L200 (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
PLO2c: Target was met (86%, met proficiency target)

Forensic Anthropology (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
PLO6e: Target was met (90%, met proficiency target)
PLO6f: Target was met (90%, met proficiency target)

E310 (Proficiency goal: 70% or higher)
PLO5e: Target was met (84%, met proficiency target)
PLO5d: Target was met (84%, met proficiency target)

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Deviant Behavior (S320): Recommend no changes in the overall assessment of this learning outcome in Deviant Behavior and Social Control. I feel confident that this course reinforces the knowledge and application of dominant theoretical perspectives. The three problematic questions (one for labeling, 1 for rational choice, and 1 for control) will be examined closely to see if the question structure or coverage in the texts or lectures needs to be supplemented.

2. Gender Inequality (S413): There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 1f and 4d as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes. With regard to outcome 1g, the question placed more emphasis on negative consequences of a gender imbalance and not proposal for solutions. The question will be modified, in the next offering, to shift the emphasis to specific solutions. This was a particularly good group of students with strong critical thinking skills.

3. Queer Identities (S410Q): Recommend no changes in the assessment of outcomes 1F, 4B or, 4C as the results reflect high levels of mastery of the learning outcomes. With regard to 1g: While this is a strong result for this outcome, the assignment could be modified by changing the language slightly in the assignment to have them investigate all four levels more explicitly. Because the assignment specifically asked students to look at social movements the majority of their analysis was focus on the structural and cultural changes.

4. Human Origins (A103): There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 3e and 3f as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes.
5. **Culture and Society (A104):** There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 3e and 3f as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes.

6. **Language and Culture (L200):** There are no recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcome 2c as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of this learning outcome.

7. **Forensic Anthropology (B320):** Lab time was increased from the previous year which improved performance on the midterm and quizzes. This structure will be used in the next offering and the results will be analyzed again to check for consistency.

8. **Cultures of Africa (E310):** There is only a minor recommended changes at this time for the assessment of outcomes 5d and 5e as a high percentage of the students demonstrated mastery of these learning outcomes. The quizzes were reduced to three from four and an additional textbook was added to the course this past year. This structure will be used in the next offering and the results will be analyzed again to check for consistency.

---

**Section 2.8- Communication**

Action steps generated from 2014-2015 assessment:

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.**

Assessment results for 2016-2017:

- **Proficiency goal (Direct measure):** 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.
- **Proficiency goal (Indirect measure):** 80% of students would have “Perceived Proficiency” or higher.

**PLO1:** Target was not met (48%, n=10 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (100%, n=21 met proficiency target)

**PLO2:** Target was not met (57%, n=12 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (100%, n=21 met proficiency target)

**PLO3:** Target was not met (38%, n=8 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (95%, n=20 met proficiency target)

**PLO4a:** Target was met (86%, n=18 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (85%, n=18 met proficiency target)

**PLO4b:** Target was not met (24%, n=5 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (95%, n=20 met proficiency target)

**PLO5:** Target was not met (57%, n=12 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (100%, n=21 met proficiency target)

**PLO6:** Target was met (70%, n=14 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (38%, n=8 met proficiency target)  
Indirect Target was met (91%, n=19 met proficiency target)

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.*
Action steps for the coming year:

1. Modify rubrics for the capstone course and presentation to address the difficulties in the assessment and learning.
2. Modify the capstone course to address student difficulties with research project and other options in the capstone project.
3. Discuss, plan and possibly implement at least 1 types of assignment across a few courses in the program.
4. Include formal language about portfolios in the syllabi so that students plan to save the documents and prepare collect portfolios by the end of their career at IU East.

Section 2.9- Criminal Justice

Action steps generated from 2015-2016 assessment:

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.

Assessment results for 2016-2017:

Proficiency goal (Direct measure): 70% of the students scoring “Proficiency” or higher.

PLO1: Target was met (73% (n=19) met proficiency target)
Discontinuity- IUE Native students scored statistically higher that Transfer students (p= .005, d= 1.089).

PLO2: Target was not met (57.7% (n=15) met proficiency target)
No Discontinuity.

PLO3: Target was met (69.6% (n=18) met proficiency target)
No Discontinuity.

PLO4: Target was met (73.1% (n=19) met proficiency target)
No Discontinuity.

Action steps for the coming year:

1. Continue to monitor faculty course realignment of courses.
2. Implement centralized assessment structure, using the Canvas LMS, to increase data collection consistency. A centralized assessment system would allow the program improve data collection and track student learning across their matriculation.
3. Develop a robust formative assessment system.
4. Continue the discussion on requiring prerequisite classes.

Section 3.0- Spanish

This is the first year that Spanish was assessed as an independent major. Therefore, there are no action items from the 2015-2016 academic year.
Assessment results for 2016-2017:
- **PLO1** Proficiency goal (Direct measure): All students answering 50% of the questions correctly on assessment exams.
- **PLO2** Proficiency goal (Direct measure): All students to use 30 words on the final assessment exam.

**PLO1:** Target was met (65% met proficiency target)
**PLO2:** Target was met (100% met proficiency target)

*Data disaggregation and implicit bias tests were not reported.*

---

**Section-3 Observations and Recommendations**

**Section 3.1- Assessment Observations and Trends**

The culture of assessment at IU East continues to develop. Some HSS programs continue to have assessment procedures that are more refined than others. The goal for the upcoming academic year is to strengthen the assessment programs that have missing components and to ensure that all required statistical tests are conducted. The HSS assessment Committee continues to suffer from a high degree of turnover, which contributes to a slower evolution of various HSS assessment processes.

**Section 3.2- Goals and Recommendations for AY2016-2017**

The HSS assessment committee goals for AY2017-2018 are as follows:
1. Revise the data disaggregation processes, which were implemented in the 2016-2017 assessment cycle.
2. Complete all missing assessment documentation from the 2015-2018.
3. Implement the use of indirect assessment instruments in all HSS programs.
4. Explore moving to a more centralized assessment system for HSS.

The HSS assessment committee chair’s recommendation for AY2016-2017 are as follows:
1. Continue the IUPUI Assessment Institute rotation for the HSS assessment committee.
   I would like to send all new committee members to the institute as well as 4 returning members. The attendance of returning committee members would help existing committee members to stay abreast of new assessment methods.

2. Create fixed-terms of service on the HSS assessment committee.
   Implementing fixed three-year terms on the HSSAC may help to address the high turnover rate on the HSSAC. Of course, a fixed-term cannot account for situations in which a faculty member leaves the university all together but a fixed term may help reduce other cases of transient membership.