Bailey College of Engineering & Technology

Number of Programs Reporting: 18
Total Number of Programs: 26

Participation Rate: 69% (down from 95%)
Average Rating: Mature

Score Summary

Data reflects evaluation of assessment practice as described by each academic program in their Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report (SOASR). A new rubric was designed for evaluation starting with this AY 2021-22 assessment cycle that shifts from a numerical score to an evaluative rating. The range of ratings is Exemplary (E) (highest), Mature (M), Developing (D), Undeveloped (U), and Cannot Evaluate (CE).

	Dimensions of Assessment Practice Evaluated with the SOASR Rubric					
Program	**Learning Outcomes**	**Performance Measures & Benchmarks**	**Results & Analysis**	**Continuous Improvement**	**Overall Score**	**Prior AY Overall Score**
BS Automotive ET	M	D	D	M	**Mature**	Mature
BS Civil ET						Developing
BSE Engineering	M	M	D	D	**Developing**	Mature
BS Eng Tech Mngmt	M	M	D	D	**Developing**	Mature
BS Manufacturing ET	M	M	CE	CE	**Cannot Evaluate**	Developing
BS Mechanical ET	M	D	D	D	**Cannot Evaluate**	Developing
BS Packaging ET	M	D	M	E	**Mature**	Mature
BS Tech & Eng Ed	M	M	CE	CE	**Cannot Evaluate**	Mature
MS Tech Mngmt	M	M	M	M	**Mature**	Cannot Evaluate
PhD Tech Mngmt						Developing
BS Aviation Mngmt	D	D	M	D	**Developing**	Developing
BS PAFT	D	M	M	E	**Mature**	Mature
BS Unmanned Syst						Cannot Evaluate
BS Architectural ET	M	D	D	CE	**Developing**	Mature
BS CNST	M	E	M	D	**Mature**	Mature
BFA IAD	M	M	M	M	**Mature**	Cannot Evaluate
BS SAFETY	M	D	M	D	**Developing**	Mature
MS OSM	M	M	D	M	**Mature**	Mature
BS Computer ET						Mature
BS Electronics ET						Mature
MS ECT	M	M	M	M	**Mature**	Mature
BS ACET	M	M	M	M	**Mature**	Mature
BS Information ET	M	D	D	U	**Developing**	Developing
MS Career & Technical Education						

Evaluation Summary

Mode Score	Mature	Mature	Mature	Developing	**Mature**	Mature

Student Learning Outcome Achievement Summary

This data represents student achievement of learning outcomes that were evaluated this cycle in aggregate. It is not evaluated, and it is not included in the evaluation of assessment practice scores above. Faculty are encouraged to report accurate findings in order to best pinpoint issues and plan for improvement. As such, these data should be used only for reference and planning, rather than as a proxy for program success/strength.



Key:
Met all = All expectations* for student learning outcomes achievement were met or exceeded.
Met most = More than half but not all expectations* for student learning outcomes achievement were met or exceeded.
Met half = Half of all expectations* for student learning outcomes achievement were met or exceeded.
Met few = Less than half of all expectations* for student learning outcomes achievement were met or exceeded.
Met none = No expectations* for student learning outcomes achievement were met or exceeded.
Cannot evaluate = Some aspect of the information provided made it impossible to evaluate data fairly.

**Faculty of each program set program-specific expectations for student achievement of learning outcomes. Expectations vary widely from program to program; however, they are generally found to be reasonable.*

AY 23-24 STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT & SUCCESS REPORT
OPTION A: TABLE FORMAT

Academic Program:	Automation and Control Engineering Technology (ACET)	**Date:**	11-20-2024
Author(s):	Maria Javaid		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		__X_ Learning Outcomes _X__ Curriculum Map _X__ Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		___ Yes _X__ No ___ Hybrid	

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Benchmark for Proficiency**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark**	**Prior Results for Comparison** (if applicable)
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
1. An ability to apply knowledge, techniques, skills and modern tools of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology to solve broadly-defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline.	ECT 281	1.1. Student will apply knowledge of Programmable Logic Controllers and Ladder Logic to solve real world automation problems involving Counters, Timers and Boolean Logical operations and simulate those on Programmable Logic Controller trainer provided in the laboratory.	1.1 Automation Laboratory assignment No.6 1.2 Automation Laboratory assignment No.7	75% of students achieve 75% or better score in the two associated laboratory assignments.	For laboratory assignment Number 6 92% of the students achieved 75% or better score. For laboratory assignment Number 7 88% of the students achieved 75% or better score.	Not Applicable
2. an ability to design systems, components, or processes meeting specified needs for broadly-defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline	ECT 324	2.1. Learn electronics principles through the project of developing DC power supply.	2.1 Laboratory Assignment of Project Part No 1. 2.2 Laboratory Assignment of Project Part No 2.	75% of students achieve 80% or better score in the two associated laboratory assignments.	For both the laboratory assignments 100% of the students achieved 80% or better score.	Not applicable

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in Blue Reports to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	Hands-on Laboratory Sessions and Advising
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	Making IEEE student chapter and its associated co-curricular activities more frequent.

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Major College	Retention % (Next Fall)							
	Fall 2020				Fall 2021			
	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior
Automat&Control Engineer Tech (E933)	60.00%	80.00%	100.00%	66.67%		100.00%	80.00%	

	Academic Year		Enrollment Year					Total Undergrad	Total Grad	Degrees Awarded			
			1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th			Associates	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorates
Current Year	20/21	FT	5	5	1	5	1	17			3		
		PT				1	2	3					
1	19/20	FT	4	2	2	11	3	22			8		
		PT					2	2					
2	18/19	FT	3	1	6	16	7	33			20		
		PT				3	1	4					
3	17/18	FT	4	5	21	15	4	49			22		
		PT				4	3	7					
4	16/17	FT	9	18	17	14	8	66			26		
		PT	1		3	4	4	12					

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*	**SLO 1** **Summary of Aggregated Assessment Data (across all PIs):** Faculty collect information related to the SO assessed. The program coordinator then evaluates the data. The data were collected from laboratory reports, which can be found in the course folder. The laboratory handouts provided to students are also available in the same folder. **Results of Evaluation of Aggregated Assessment Data:**

	In Fall 2023, the total students in the class were 25. For Performance indicator (PI) 1.1, 92% students performed all requirements of laboratory experiments and submitted the laboratory reports. Thus, scoring more than 75%. For Performance indicator (PI) 1.2, 88% students performed all requirements of laboratory experiments and submitted the laboratory reports. Thus, scoring more than 75%. **SLO 2** **Summary of Aggregated Assessment Data (across all PIs):** Faculty collect information related to the SO assessed. The program coordinator then evaluates the data. The data were collected from laboratory reports, which can be found in the course folder. The laboratory handouts provided to students are also available in the same folder. **Results of Evaluation of Aggregated Assessment Data:** In Spring 2024, there were 2 students in ECT 324. Labs were graded for correctness. To receive credit, the student had to show the working lab to the instructor as well as any calculations needed to demonstrate the application of electronic systems. The instructor then verified that the student had built the lab correctly. Average completion rate was 100%. Students were satisfied with time allotted to complete labs. Instructor of the course assists in questions as students ask them.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	**SLO 1** **Actions for Continuous Improvement:** In Fall 2023, to assist students in performing laboratory experiments, instructor prepared video demonstrations using laboratory equipment involving explanation and instructions. This allowed the students to watch those demonstrations before and during performing experiments as per their need instead of requiring instructor to demonstrate each particular aspect whenever they have any confusion. In Fall 2019, there were total 24 in ECT 281, 75% of total 24 students scored more than 75% in laboratory experiment no. 1 (SO1.1) and 83% students scored more than 75% in laboratory experiment no. 2 (SO1.2). Although the scores of overall class seems satisfactory, the whole class struggled hard in completing the experiments. To overcome these problems in students' performance, following improvements have been implemented. 1) Instructor has realized that students find formulation and logical solution of automation problem hard to perform as it is the first time they are doing such exercise. So, instructor give more examples of such problem solving and demonstrate solving the first problem to provide guidance to students. 2) For laboratory experiments no. 1 and no. 2 the total class with more than 20 students was divided in two groups so that students can get more individual attention. Also, one graduate assistant was helping instructor in guiding students. 3) Since, experiment no.1 require more discussion among students instructor had allowed for group size of 4 students instead of 2 students groups which are practiced for all other experiments. 4) Instructor has also increased the duration of experiment no. 1 to two laboratory sessions instead of one laboratory session used in Fall 2019. This gives students more time to complete the experiment.

	SLO 2 **Actions for Continuous Improvement:** Faculty will ensure student success by continuously working with students to ensure they demonstrate the ability to implement analog and digital electronics to electrical systems. Faculty will demonstrate more examples and implement more labs in order to give students more opportunities to implement analog and digital systems. Faculty will also provide feedback on all labs.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	For next year, the assessment plan is to focus on ABET Student learning Outcomes of 3, 4 and 5 which are **Student Outcome 3:** an ability to apply written, oral, and graphical communication in broadly-defined technical and non-technical environments; and an ability to identify and use appropriate technical literature. **Student Outcome 4:** an ability to conduct standard tests, measurements, and experiments and to analyze and interpret the results to improve processes. **Student Outcome 5:** an ability to function effectively as a member as well as a leader on technical teams.
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	**Assessment Instruments:** The Department holds a shared folder in which each Program Coordinator will contribute each course evaluation prior to each assessment cycle. Each course has its own concordance document which contains all data for the course, per semester. The laboratory handouts and student reports are saved as a .pdf or Word document to be located in the digital course document for easy access.

Curriculum Map

Automation and Control Engineering Technology Major

(79 credits)

Degree Map

Industrial automation is the use of control systems, predominately computer based, to control industrial machinery and processes.

Required Courses:

Electronics and Computer Technology (26 credits):

- ECT 130 - Introduction to Electronics and Computer Technology 2 Credits
- ECT 165 - D.C. Circuits and Design 3 Credits
- ECT 167 - A.C. Circuits and Design 3 Credits
- ECT 231 - Digital Computer Logic 3 Credits
- ECT 232 - Digital Computer Circuits 3 Credits
- ECT 281 - Introduction to Robotics and Automation 3 Credits
- ECT 381 - Advanced Robotics and Automation 3 Credits
- ECT 444 - Programmable Logic Controllers and Control Systems 3 Credits
- ECT 480 - Applications of Robotic and Automation Systems 3 Credits

Manufacturing Technology (12 credits):

- MFG 225 - Introduction to Materials, Processes, and Testing 3 Credits
- MFG 370 - Fundamentals of Manufacturing Processes 3 Credits
- MFG 371 - Manufacturing Processes and Materials 3 Credits
- MFG 376 - Computer Numerical Control Systems 3 Credits

Mathematics/Computer Science and Physical Science requirements (14 credits):

- Courses in chemistry, geology, biology, or physics 8 credits
- CS 256 - Principles of Structured Design 3 Credits

  or higher level structured language.

  MATH 129 - Fundamentals and Applications of Calculus 3 Credits

Mechanical Engineering Technology (15 credits):

- MET 103 - Introduction to Technical Graphics with CAD 3 Credits
- MET 203 - Introduction to Solid Modeling 3 Credits
- MET 299 - CAD Fundamentals 3 Credits
- MET 329 - Fluid Power Technology 2 Credits
- MET 329L - Fluid Power Technology Laboratory 1 Credits
- MET 403 - Advanced Computer Aided Design (CAD) Concepts 3 Credits

Technology Management (9 credits):

- ECT 437 - Industrial Computer Systems Management 3 Credits
- TMGT 478 - Industrial Organization and Functions 3 Credits
- TMGT 492 - Industrial Supervision 3 Credits

Directed Foundational Studies (3 credits):

- MATH 115 - College Algebra 3 Credits

Degree Map

This program has the following minimum GPA requirements: 2.00 overall GPA. Program may not be able to fall under the Sycamore Graduation Guarantee, depending upon student preparation.

Fall 1st Year

- ECT 130 - Introduction to Electronics and Computer Technology 2 Credits (Critical Course)
- ECT 165 - D.C. Circuits and Design 3 Credits (Critical Course)
  ENG 101 - Freshman Writing I 3 Credits

  MATH 115 - College Algebra 3 Credits (Critical Course)

- Foundational Studies: Health | 3 Credits

14 Credits

Spring 1st Year

MET 103 - Introduction to Technical Graphics with CAD 3 Credits (Critical Course)

or

- ECT 231 - Digital Computer Logic 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- ECT 167 - A.C. Circuits and Design 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- ENG 105 - Freshman Writing II 3 Credits
- Foundational Studies: Communication | Credits / Units: 3
- Foundational Studies: Laboratory Sciences | 4 Credits

16 Credits

Fall 2nd Year

- CS 256 - Principles of Structured Design 3 Credits
- MET 103 - Introduction to Technical Graphics with CAD 3 Credits (Critical Course)

or

- ECT 231 - Digital Computer Logic 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- ECT 281 - Introduction to Robotics and Automation 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- MET 203 - Introduction to Solid Modeling 3 Credits
- Foundational Studies: Social and Behavioral Sciences | 3 Credits

15 Credits

Spring 2nd Year

- MET 329 - Fluid Power Technology 2 Credits
- MET 329L - Fluid Power Technology Laboratory 1 Credits
- ECT 232 - Digital Computer Circuits 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- MET 299 - CAD Fundamentals 3 Credits (Critical Course)

or

- MFG 371 - Manufacturing Processes and Materials 3 Credits (Critical Course)

or

MFG 376 - Computer Numerical Control Systems 3 Credits (Critical Course)

Foundational Studies: Fine and Performing Arts | Credits/Units 3

- Elective | Credits/Units 2

14 Credits

Fall 3rd Year

MFG 225 - Introduction to Materials, Processes, and Testing 3 Credits

- MFG 370 - Fundamentals of Manufacturing Processes 3 Credits MFG 371 - Manufacturing Processes and Materials 3 Credits (Critical
- Course) or
- MFG 376 - Computer Numerical Control Systems 3 Credits (Critical Course) or
- MET 299 - CAD Fundamentals 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- Foundational Studies: History | Credits / Units: 3
- Foundational Studies: Literary Studies | 3 Credits

15 Credits

Spring 3rd Year

- MET 299 - CAD Fundamentals 3 Credits (Critical Course) (Critical Course)

or

- MFG 371 - Manufacturing Processes and Materials 3 Credits (Critical Course) or

- MFG 376 - Computer Numerical Control Systems 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- ECT 381 - Advanced Robotics and Automation 3 Credits (Critical Course)
- MATH 129 - Fundamentals and Applications of Calculus 3 Credits
- Foundational Studies: Junior Composition | Credits / Units: 3
- Foundational Studies: Laboratory Sciences | 4 Credits

16 Credits

Fall 4th Year

TMGT 492 - Industrial Supervision 3 Credits

Foundational Studies: GPCD | 3 Credits

15 Credits

Spring 4th Year

- MET 403 - Advanced Computer Aided Design (CAD) Concepts 3 Credits

  TMGT 478 - Industrial Organization and Functions 3 Credits
- Foundational Studies: Ethics and Social Responsibility | Credits / Units: 3
- Foundational Studies: UDIE | Credits/Units 3 Foundational Studies: UDIE | Credits/Units 3
- 15 Credits

For more information on 15 to Finish please visit https://learnmoreindiana.org/college/succeedingincollege/graduating-on-time/

Indiana State University's priority date for filing the FAFSA is April 15. Students must earn 30 credit hours each academic year in order to maximize financial aid from the state of Indiana. Details about how to apply for financial aid, eligibility criteria, and awarding rules are available online at https://www.indstate.edu/financial-aid/apply. Students may view their specific financial file by logging into the MyISU Portal at https://www.isuportal.indstate.edu.

Program Description and Career Resources:

https://www.indstate.edu/academics/undergraduate/majors/automation-control

6- Year Assessment Plan

The B.S. in ACET degree has the following SOs:

(1) an ability to apply knowledge, techniques, skills and modern tools of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology to solve broadly-defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline;

(2) an ability to design systems, components, or processes meeting specified needs for broadly-defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline;

(3) an ability to apply written, oral, and graphical communication in broadly-defined technical and non-technical environments; and an ability to identify and use appropriate technical literature;

(4) an ability to conduct standard tests, measurements, and experiments and to analyze and interpret the results to improve processes; and

(5) an ability to function effectively as a member as well as a leader on technical teams. The ACET program SOs can be found at https://www.indstate.edu/technology/acet

Program	2021- 2022		2022-2023		2023-2024		2024-2025		2025-2026		2026-2027		2027-2028	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring		
ACET			SO 3 (ECT437)	SO 3 (ECT438) SO 5 (ECT438)	SO 1 (ECT281) SO 2 (ECT165) SO 4 (ECT480)	SO 2 (ECT343)	SO 3 (ECT437)	SO 3 (ECT438) SO 5 (ECT438)	SO 1 (ECT281) SO 2 (ECT165) SO 4 (ECT480)	SO 2 (ECT343)	SO 3 (ECT437) SO 5 (ECT480)	Closing the loop & Self Study Report	Self Study Report	ABET Site Visit

AY 21-22 STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT & SUCCESS REPORT

OPTION B: NARRATIVE FORMAT

Academic Program:		**Date:**	
Author(s):			
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		___ Learning Outcomes ___ Curriculum Map ___ Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		___ Yes ___ No ___ Hybrid	

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

- Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.)
- Established Benchmark for Proficiency
- Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Benchmark (provide specific data rather than general observations)
- Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in Blue Reports to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24 Program: Automation & Control Engineering Technology BS

Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LOs are complex. To ensure assessment produces accurate data that addresses all components of each outcome, assessment measures have to capture the nuances of each.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)		Mature

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described		Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.	Excellent discussion of faculty examination of findings and plans to support ongoing student learning success.	Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Mature

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Automotive Engineering Technology	**Date:**	11/18/2024
Author(s):	Randy Peters		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.		__X_ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both	

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
1. an ability to apply knowledge, techniques, skills and modern tools of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology to solve broadly defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline	AET 435 Engine Thermo	(1) Students take the 8 exams from Automotive Service Excellence (2) At the end of the semester students are required to take an exit survey	(1) ASE Certification tests (2) Exit Survey	(1) ASE pass rate is >70% (2) Survey avg >3.5 out of 5.0	(1) ASE pass rate is 62% for last two years 2023 and 2024 (2) Survey Results 4.0 (3 students in 2022 only)	(1) ASE pass rate was 48% for 2022 and 2023 (2) Exit results 4.0 of 5.0
4. an ability to conduct standard tests, measurements, and experiments and to analyze and interpret the results to improve processes	AET 435 Engine Thermo	(1) Students take the eight automotive certification exams from Automotive Service Excellence (2) At the end of the semester students are required to take an exit survey	(1) ASE tests (2) Exit Survey	(1) ASE pass rate is >70% (2) Survey avg >3.5 out of 5.0	(1) ASE pass rate is 62% for last two years 2023 and 2024 (2) Survey Results 2.7 (3 students in 2022 only)	(1) ASE pass rate was 48% for 2022 and 2023 (2) Exit results 4.0 of 5.0
5. an ability to function effectively as a member as well as a leader on technical teams	AET 435 Engine Thermo	(1) At the end of the semester students are required to take an exit survey (2) in AET 436 students complete a group project	(1) Exit Survey (2) Teamwork Rubric	(1) Survey avg >3.5 out of 5.0 (2) Rubric avg >26 out of 36	(1) Survey Results 4.3 (3 students in 2022 only) (2) Rubric results 27.5 out of 36 (FA 2020 and 2021 combined 23 students)	(1) Exit results 4.0 of 5.0 (2) Rubric results 25 of 36

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	1. We need to remember to systematically survey graduates in fall and spring semesters for data. 2. The ASE test scores have improved dramatically, indicating the attitude of the professor has a profound impact on the performance of students. 3. We need to ensure the exit survey is administered to all graduating seniors and that they actually take the survey. 4. the new curriculum approved three years ago is now included in the program. Seniors will now take a two-semester sequence of senior project (ET 421 and ET 499) which should increase their survey results and enhance their abilities with regard to research and development in the automotive area. 5. The inclusion of AET 437 will enhance the content on electric vehicles while the removal of AET 457 fleet management will help to concentrate the focus on engineering technology. AET 437 is now scheduled to be taught for the first time in AY 25/26.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	1. Enrollment is stabile in the mid 40's for the last 4 years 2. Averaging about 10 graduates per year for the last 5 years
What student success indicators are concerning?	1. Nothing on the program profile is particularly concerning. 2. There is a potential concern that student learning will be diminished during the renovation to the TA building as the AET program lab is housed there. It will be offline for at least two years. Faculty will of course do their best to offer as many lab activities as possible within the TC building.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	The primary focus from 2022 was to hire an assistant professor. This new hire started in August of 2023 but left us at the end of the fall semester. We searched for a new hire again and successfully hired an AET faculty for the fall of 2024, so we hope to see some improvement in the program within a couple of years. Last year we were concerned with the ASE assessment testing trends. With faculty involvement and letting students know the importance of the assessments, the results seemed much more positive. Hopefully we will repeat that process with similar results.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Students are excited about the inclusion of Electric Vehicles in our curriculum and the new (newest) assistant professor has helped this process. We need to review or develop course assignments to address the student outcomes, as we switch from AET 436 and AET 435 for SO 3 and 5 to AET 435 and ET 499. ET 499 is set up appropriately, but we must have data collected by the professors of ET 499.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	We hope to convey the need for data to the professor of ET 499 for all programs which it supports.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Next year we will return to student outcomes 2 ands 3 in the assessment plan. At this time, we do not plan on making any changes to the methods but will focus more on obtaining the data in a timely fashion during the spring 2025 semester.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	There are two faculty members in the department dedicated to the AET program. We share data regularly. We also share the data with the department faculty. When we hold advisory board meetings they receive the information as well.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Automotive Engineering Technology BS

Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LOs are measurable, but multifaceted (LO1, LO4) and vague (LO5). If rubrics and ASE tests are sufficiently granular, they may account for this. If not, revised LOs may make measurability more precise.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.	Good use of ASE certification tests to ensure relevance of student learning assessment.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) ***– in some cases, see notes*** Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) ***–in some cases, see notes*** Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***–in some cases, see notes***	Unclear how the ASE certifications tests align to the LOs directly (as opposed to indirectly), given the same tests and reported scores are used for two different, complex LOs. Are the ASE tests knowledge-based, or do they require students to demonstrate their "ability to conduct" the skills noted in LO4. It seems like including data from classroom-based measures would provide more accurate data relative to the LOs, and could be great data in tandem with the ASE data. It could also help pinpoint some of the issues that need most remediation. Does the teamwork rubric measure students on how well they both lead and act as a member on the team?	Developing

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	Is it possible to disaggregate data by the 8 different ASE tests and which parts of LO1 and LO4 they correspond to? This would really help with identifying to specific weaknesses in student mastery in order to better inform changes to curriculum or teaching. Similarly, with the average score just barely exceeding the performance goal for LO5, would looking at the criterion scores on the rubric give better insights for informing areas for remediation?	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	Not a recommendation, but just a note – has the Dean been able to help coordinate alternatives to the AET program lab space given the renovations? Can the advisory board connect students with community partners who can support this? Continue to monitor the trends in the ASE scores to determine if students taking it seriously is the factor influencing improvement.	Mature

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Architectural Engineering Technology	**Date:**	12.10.2024
Author(s):	Azizi Arrington-Slocum		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.		_X__ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both	

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
Student Outcome 1: an ability to apply knowledge, techniques, skills and modern tools of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology to solve broadly-defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline; 1.1. Apply fundamental methods and elementary analytical techniques in sub-disciplines related to architectural engineering.	CNST 318 Statics and Strength of Materials	CNST 318: Quiz #5	CNST 318: Answer key	70% of students will score 70/100 or better	100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.	
		CNST 318: Assignment #6	CNST 318: Rubric allotting points		92.6% of the students scored 70/100 or better.	
Student Outcome 3: an ability to apply written, oral, and graphical communication in broadly-defined technical	ARET 206 Residential Design & Construction	Students are tasked with utilizing industry-standard software (Revit, Adobe Creative Suite, and online tools) to complete a	Rubric	70% of students will score 70/100 or better	Over 90% of the students scored 70 out of 100 or higher.	

and non-technical environments; and an ability to identify and use appropriate technical literature; 3.1. Utilize instruments, methods, software, and techniques that are appropriate to produce Architect/Engineer (A/E) documents and presentations.		project focused on developing residential architectural design and construction documents.				
Student Outcome 3: an ability to apply written, oral, and graphical communication in broadly-defined technical and non-technical environments; and an ability to identify and use appropriate technical literature; 3.2. Apply principles of building codes, regulations, and ethics in architectural practice.	ARET 206 Residential Design & Construction	Students are tasked with applying relevant codes, standards, and ethical considerations in architecture to complete a project focused on developing residential architectural design and construction documents.	Rubric	70% of students will score 70/100 or better	Over 90% of the students scored 70 out of 100 or higher.	
Student Outcome 3: an ability to apply written, oral, and graphical communication in broadly-defined technical and non-technical environments; and an ability to identify and use appropriate technical literature; 3.2. Apply principles of building codes,	ARET 206 Residential Design & Construction	Students are tasked with applying relevant codes, standards, and ethical considerations in architecture to complete a project focused on developing residential architectural design and construction documents.	Rubric	70% of students will score 70/100 or better	Over 90% of the students scored 70 out of 100 or higher.	

regulations, and ethics in architectural practice.						

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	The ARET 206 course is going very well. It is the only major course but provides students with an opportunity to explore design, codes, construction and connect all of their knowledge together in this course.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	Enrollment for this semester is showing an increase, fall 2023 36 students, fall 2024 42 students.
What student success indicators are concerning?	Enrollment for the program has been continuously declining prior to this academic year. Graduation 4-year rates are not good and have been declining, under 10% for fall 2020. Average years to graduation for 2023-24 academic year are 4.4 and total credits to degree are 148.7.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	This program is slated for suspension. It is currently making its rounds through the curriculog process. It only has two major courses, ARET 206 and an internship course. However, it has no faculty and for it to be successful, it needs additional major courses and a dedicated faculty. This is not a resource that can currently be supported. Many of the students have a desire to be architects, yet in the ARET program they do minimal design in this program, those students can be directed towards the interior architecture design program. The students that have an interest in the technical side can be geared towards either construction or safety management.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	The current students will be taught out if the suspension is approved.

What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	Program is being suspended, resources have not been given to support it.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	None, program is being suspended.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	No faculty for this program. Faculty within the department teach the courses and engage with the students as best as possible.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Architectural Engineering Technology BS

Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LOs are compound, meaning assessment tools must be granular enough to ensure accurate measurement of all aspects of each LO.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) ***– difficult to determine, see notes*** Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)	It is hard to determine from the descriptions of the measures and the way data are reported whether the rubrics and quiz key are reporting data only on the LO in question, or if they're reporting composite data – the overall score on the assignment or quiz. It really needs to be the former in order to assure each LO is independently measured.	Developing

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used ***– in some cases, but not all*** Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	Threshold does not reflect reasonably high expectations. For LO3, data are reported as "over 90% of the students" rather than specifically how many or what exact percentage met or exceeded the stated threshold.	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	If approval is given to suspend the program, be sure to check any ABET requirements for how to proceed.	Cannot Evaluate

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Aviation Management	**Date:**	December 11, 2024
Author(s):	Troy Allen		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	__X_ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
1.1 Knowledge of air traffic control operations	AVT 491	Research/ Course Presentation	Rubric	At least 75 percent of the students will score 80 percent or higher on the project on the culminating experience. Student in the course.	**Fall 2023** - The 15 students in the course completed the assignment. All 15 students were awarded 100% on the assignment **Spring 2024** – There were 16 studex3bnts in the course. 13 students received 100% on the assignment. The other three were docked for late	I do not have access to this information

					submission and received 93%.	
1.2 Knowledge of airport operations	AVT 491	Research/ Course Presentation	Rubric	At least 75 percent of the students will score 80 percent or higher on the project on the culminating experience. Student in the course.	**Fall 2023** - The 15 students in the course completed the assignment. All 15 students were awarded 100% on the assignment **Spring 2024** – There were 16 studex3bnts in the course. 13 students received 100% on the assignment. The other three were docked for late submission and received 93%.	
1.3 Knowledge of federal aviation regulations	AVT 491	Research/ Course Presentation	Rubric	At least 75 percent of the students will score 80 percent or higher on the project on the culminating experience. Student in the course.	**Fall 2023** - The 15 students in the course completed the assignment. All 15 students were awarded 100% on the assignment **Spring 2024** – There were 16 studex3bnts in	

					the course. 13 students received 100% on the assignment. The other three were docked for late submission and received 93%.	

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	The assessment results have not identified any major changes needed in the program. However, this is only one tool used to stay abreast of changes. In addition to this method the department is in constant communication with alumni and industry partners to maintain a robust program. Appropriate curriculum changes as deficiencies are uncovered.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	Solid understanding of important elements of aviation management that are firmly embedded in core curriculum
What student success indicators are concerning?	None
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	In addition to this more formal data collection the faculty are in touch with alumni and other industry experts to stay abreast of changes in the industry that necessitate changes we need to make in the program. This can be in curriculum but is also in additional industry certifications or internship experiences. It is a holistic approach that couples qualitative data with the quantitative data that is collected from this more formalized process. We find this to be effective. Instead of waiting for the end of assessment cycle information to be collated and analyzed we can act quicker to insert changes that move us from good to even better.

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	I don't have access to it.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	None as we are meeting our stated assessment objectives.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	None
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	We will focus on those listed in our assessment cycle documents
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	Once data is collected/analyzed the results are shared with the Department Chair and faculty members. This typically occurs at a faculty meeting but dependent upon the results can occur in less formal settings.

Academic Program:		**Date:**	
Author(s):			
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

- Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.)
- Established Performance Goal
- Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Goal (provide specific data rather than general observations)
- Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?

2. Student Success Activities

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?

What student success indicators are concerning?

Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.

Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?

What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how findings will be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Aviation Management BS
Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LOs are exceeding vague – "knowledge of" is broad, generic, and hard to measure without further specific of the degree to which knowledge is attained and integrated.	Developing
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)	<<Cannot determine. Because the same assignment is used for all 3 LOs and the reports scores are all the same, I cannot tell if the rubric measures each LO independently of the others, which is necessary for precise alignment and data that accurately reflects student mastery of the specific LO.	Developing

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used ***- somewhat, see notes*** Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	Since students all received perfect scores, it is impossible to tell if reported data reflects component scores that align solely with each LO or the cumulate score for the entire assignment. It needs to be the former for the data accurately reflect LO mastery.	Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	Given the noted issues with accessing prior year's information, I recommend utilizing the BCET Teams site to ensure all annual assessment information is collected and stored in a consistent and accessible manner.	Developing

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

To accommodate demands on faculty time and programs undergoing accreditation or program review, SOASR will be accepted on a rolling basis.

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE DEAN OR ASSESSMENT DIRECTOR REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Early Submission:

Last Day to Submit:

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate Dean or Assessment Director, as guidelines vary by college.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	BSE in Engineering	**Date:**	12/10/2024
Author(s):	Riem Rostom		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Director of Assessment & Program Effectiveness, at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		_X__ Learning Outcomes ___ Curriculum Map ___ Assessment Plan	
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students.		_X__ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both	

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	Assessment Strategies Used			Established Benchmark for Proficiency	Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark	Prior Results for Comparison
	Course	Assignment Activity	Evaluation Tool i.e., rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
2.an ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specified needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors	ENGR 499	Senior Project Schedule and take the Fundamentals of Engineering Exam (FE)	NCEES FE Exam Exit Survey	FE EXAM - Ratio Score each cat >.80 & all cat avg >.90 P Project Rubric avg > 4.0/5.0 Survey avg score > 3.5/5.0	FE Exam results: 6 students took the exam, with 1 student passing. Rubric AVG 4.5/5 – met	None available

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	The Rubric on the 499 shows that it has students who have met the LO 2, but the FE exam scores are showing less than 20% success rate. How do we prepare students better to pass their FE exam.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Data Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	New freshmen numbers are up from previous years. The 1st year retention rates exceed the university average. In the case of latest major, retention rate is 82.35% compared to institutional rate of 65.85% and it is trending up.

What student success indicators are concerning?	The total number of students expected/projected to be in the program at this point is significantly more than the actual number. Students may rather have a specific area of engineering degree than a general engineering degree.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	Applications and admits for the program continue to be strong while the actual yield numbers are relatively small. The program is visible to prospective students.

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	Faculty still believe that students should be taking the FE exam that correlates to their concentration rather than taking the exam for other disciplines. We expect to implement this action in the spring of 2025. As an additional note, the college is undergoing a significant restructuring of programs with the plan to have the BSE program with its own department, and that goes simultaneously with the proposal on having standalone mechanical and civil engineering programs.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Students are doing well in their senior project ENGR 499 and are doing well in enrollment and retention rates, but the concern remains on the FE exam pass rate.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	The department is uniquely low on faculty resources throughout the department. This impacts the BSE program as well as many others. We are working with the administration to address these needs promptly. Create a partnership with the new VP of enrollment management to address the yield concern.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Outcomes 3, 6, and 7 will be assessed next year.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	The faculty compiled the results from ENGR 499. Faculty participate in the review and assessment of senior projects. Faculty hold tutoring sessions for the FE exam review throughout the spring semester. The FE exam results and other assessment data are shared with faculty and industry advisory members.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Engineering BSE

Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable ***– possible, but challenging – see recommendations*** Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	The LO is very compound, making it challenging to measure all components without complex assessment tools (e.g., analytical rubrics, component & composite scores, etc.).	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.	Good use of a standardized industry exam to ensure relevant displays of student learning.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***– in some cases, see notes***	Because the LO is so complex, the rubric for the senior project must be equally as complex. Does it measure all of the following?: design ability, solution production, consideration of public health, safety, & welfare, and consideration of global, cultural, social, environmental, & economic factors? Do the categories on the FE Exam align to certain aspects of the LO? If not, it is an indirect measure only. It is still valuable and relevant, but think carefully about what it can and cannot tell you about student mastery of this LO. Is the Senior Project a group activity? If so, be sure there are additional ways to measure	Mature

			individual student learning per ABET requirements.	
Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	Were there exit survey results? For the FE exam, it would be helpful to see the average scores in addition to the number of students who met the benchmark for proficiency. This would provide insight into how far off the other students were from passing. Looking at this from the perspective of category scores would provide better insight into which categories had the most severe deficiencies so you can better pinpoint how to remediate through curriculum, teaching, and other student support. Similarly, given the difference between performance on the FE Exam and the Senior Project, using more granular assessment data from the project rubric, or determining additional points of assessment throughout the curriculum might provide better insights into areas for improvement in order to improve FE exam success.	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment,		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty	<<Plans currently focus on enrollment, which is good, but what is the plan to address the gap between student performance on course-based assessments and the FE exam? Is it new assessment strategies to get better data? Is it analyzing the FE exam scores more granularly to inform curriculum or teaching changes? Is it looking at	Developing

comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	indirect data from student surveys to understand their self-reported challenges?	

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Academic Program:	*Construction Management, BS*	**Date:**	*Dec. 2, 2024*
Author(s):	*Betsy Wilkinson, MS SE, PE, SE*		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.			_*X*_ Learning Outcomes _*X*_ Curriculum Map _*X*_ Assessment Plan
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.			_*X*_ Yes ___ No ___ Hybrid

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Benchmark for Proficiency**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark**	**Prior Results for Comparison** (if applicable)
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e., rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
SLO 1: Create written communications appropriate to the construction discipline.	*CNST 118 Soils Laboratory*	*CNST 118: Lab #5 report on the Standard Proctor Compaction test.*	*Rubric allotting points for specific parts.*	*70% of the students will score 84/120 or better*	*From Spring CNST 111.001: 100% of the students scored 84/120 or better.* *From Spring CNST 111.303 & 304: 75% of the students scored 84/120 or better.*	
		CNST 118: HW #3 report on Soil Classification by USCS.		*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Spring CNST 111.001: 92.3% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Spring CNST 111.303 & 304: 77.8% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	

SLO 2: Create oral presentations appropriate to the construction discipline.	*CNST 111 Construction Materials, Methods, and Equipment*	*CNST 111:*	*CNST 111:*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Spring CNST 111.00#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Spring CNST 111.30#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
	CNST 480 Construction Capstone	*CNST 480: A recorded presentation to the fictional client of all the bid documents.*	*CNST 480: Rubric allotting points for specific parts.*	*70% of the students will score 84/120 or better*	*From Spring CNST 480.001 & 301: 100% of the students scored 84/120 or better.*	
SLO 3: Create a construction project safety plan.	*CNST 480 Construction Capstone*	*CNST 480: Develop a Site Logistics Plan (assignment item #7) that incorporates a site-specific Emergency Action Plan (EAP) (assignment item #13). They are also required to provide and explain their fictional company's Experience Modifier Rate (EMR) (assignment item #12). These are portions of the final bid package.*	*CNST 480: Rubric allotting points for specific parts.*	*70% of the students will score 35/50 or better*	*From Spring CNST 480.001 & 301: 100% of the students scored 35/50 or better.*	
		CNST 480: The groups are required to develop a list of 15 Safety Hazards (assignment item #14) that would exist on the project site and include how their fictional	*CNST 480: Rubric allotting points for specific parts.*	*70% of the students will score 43.4/62 or better*	*From Spring CNST 480.001 & 301: 100% of the students scored 43.4/62 or better.*	

		company would mitigate the hazards. These are portions of the final bid package.				
SLO 4: Create construction project cost estimates.	*CNST 314 Estimating and Bid Preparation*	*CNST 314: Assignment #2 Masonry, Metals, and Wood Estimating*	*CNST 314: Rubric to evaluate students' estimates*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 314.001: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 314.301: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
		CNST 314: Assignment #3 Thermal and Moisture Protection, Openings, and Finishes Estimating	*CNST 314: Rubric to evaluate students' estimates*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 314.001: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 314.301: 90.9% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
SLO 5: Create construction project schedules.	*CNST 304 Construction Scheduling*	*CNST 304: Final Project is a construction schedule for a commercial warehouse*	*CNST 304: Rubric to evaluate students' schedules*	*70% of the students will score 210/300 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 304.001: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 304.301: 100% of the students scored 210/300 or better.*	
	CNST 480 Construction Capstone	*CNST 480: The groups are required to develop two Residential Project Schedules (assignment item #6). The first is the base bid and the second*	*CNST 480: Rubric allotting points for specific parts.*	*70% of the students will score 36.4/52 or better*	*From Spring CNST 480.001 & 301: 100% of the students scored 36.4/52 or better.*	

		includes Alternate #1. This is a portion of the final bid package.				
SLO 6: Analyze professional decisions based on ethical principles.	*CNST 401 Ethics and Construction*	*CNST 401: Homework, Relationship A: Contractors & Owners Discussion Board*	*CNST 401: Rubric allotting points (not clear)*	*70% of the students will score 7/10 or better*	*~~From Spring CNST 401.001: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.~~* *From Spring CNST 401.301: 50% of the students scored 7/10 or better.*	
		CNST 401: Final Report on a case study.	*CNST 401: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 140/200 or better*	*~~From Spring CNST 401.001: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.~~* *From Spring CNST 401.301: 96.4% of the students scored 7/10 or better.*	
SLO 7: Analyze methods, materials, and equipment used to construct projects.	*CNST 111 Construction Materials, Methods, and Equipment*	*CNST 111: Assignment #1*	*CNST 111: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Spring CNST 111.001 & 002: 85.2% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Spring CNST 111.301: 83.3% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
		CNST 111: Exam	*CNST 111: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Spring CNST 111.001 & 002: 96.3% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	

					From Spring CNST 111.301: 66.7% of the students scored 70/100 or better.	
SLO 8: Apply electronic-based technology to manage the construction Process.	*CNST 304 Construction Scheduling*	*CNST 480: Schedule for residential bid.*	*CNST 480: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 36.4/52 or better*	*From Spring CNST 480.001&301: 100% of the students scored 70% or better.*	
		CNST 304: Schedule Development	*CNST 304: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 35/50 or better*	*~~From Spring CNST 304.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.~~* *From Spring CNST 304.301: 97% of the students scored 70% or better.*	
SLO 9: Apply basic surveying techniques for construction layout and control.	*CNST 420 Construction Surveying*	*CNST 420: Leveling Assignment requires students to match information in the sketches to columns in the table.*	*CNST 420: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 21/30 or better*	*From Spring CNST 420.001: 75% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Spring CNST 420.301: 91.7% of the students scored 21/30 or better.*	
		CNST 420: Civil Drawing quiz on Silver Birch Michigan City Civil Drawings.	*CNST 420: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 21/30 or better*	*From Spring CNST 420.001: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	*50% of the students scored a 70/100 or better in the on-campus section and 68.42% scored a 70/100 or better in the online section.*

					From Spring CNST 420.301: 91.7% of the students scored 21/30 or better.	
SLO 10: Understand different methods of project delivery and the roles and responsibilities of all constituencies involved in the design and construction process.	*CNST 201 Construction Contract Documents and Project Delivery*	*CNST 201: Construction Contract Quiz*	*CNST 201: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 201.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 201.301 & 302: 100% of the students scored 175/250 or better.*	
		CNST 201: Project paper	*CNST 201: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 175/250 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 201.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 201.301 & 302: 68.6% of the students scored 175/250 or better.*	
SLO 11: Understand construction accounting and cost control.	*CNST 330 Construction Accounting, Finance, and Safety*	*CNST 330: Finance Chapter #3 Quiz*	*CNST 330: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Spring CNST 330.001: 6.7% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Spring CNST 330.301 & 302: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	- *CNST 330-001: 92.6% of the students scored a 70/100 or better with an average score of 84.2%* - *CNST 330-301: 92.0% of the students scored a 70/100 or better*

		CNST 330: Project Level Cost Control	*CNST 330: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Spring CNST 330.001: 80% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Spring CNST 330.301 & 302: 63% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	*with an average score of 85.9%* - *CNST 330-302: 82.1% of the students scored a 70/100 or better with an average score of 76.7%*
SLO 12: Understand construction quality assurance and control.	*CNST 450 Construction Project Management*	*CNST 450: Project Scope Evaluation Assignment*	*CNST 450: Rubric allotting points (not clear)*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 450.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 450.301 & 302: 93.9% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	- *CNST 450 – 401: 100% of the students scored a 70/100 or better. The average was 95% on the assignment.* - *CNST 450 – 301: 88.89% of the students scored a 70/100 or better. The average was 80.55% on the assignment.*
		CNST 450: Costing Assignment	*CNST 450: Rubric allotting points (not clear)*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 450.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 450.301 & 302: 91.7% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
SLO 13: Understand construction project control processes.	*CNST 330 Construction Accounting, Finance, and Safety*	*CNST 330: Chapter #1 HW Quiz*	*CNST 330: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 330.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~	

					From Spring CNST 330.301 & 302: 75% of the students scored 70/100 or better.	
		CNST 330: Chapter #6 HW Quiz	*CNST 330: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 330.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 330.301 & 302: 67% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
SLO 14: Understand the legal implications of contract, common, and regulatory law to manage a construction project.	*CNST 450 Construction Project Management*	*CNST 450: Regulatory Framework Submission*	*CNST 450: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 450.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 450.301 & 302: 97.0% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	- *CNST 450 - 301: 27 out of 29 students scored above 70%. 1 student received 68.75% on the assignment and 1 student received 66.25%.* - *CNST 450 - 302: 17 out of 17 students scored above 70 %.*
		CNST 450: Regulatory Delivery Method	*CNST 450: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 450.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 450.301 & 302: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	

SLO 15: Understand the basic principles of sustainable construction.	*CNST 306 Commercial Design and Construction*	*CNST 306: Quiz*	*CNST 306: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 7/10 or better*	*From Spring CNST 306.001: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Spring CNST 306.301: 100% of the students scored 7/10 or better.*	*In 306.001 90% of the students scored a 70/100 or better*
		CNST 306: Test 2	*CNST 306: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 28/39 or better*	*From Spring CNST 306.001: 100% of the students scored 28/39 or better.* *From Spring CNST 306.301: 100% of the students scored 28/39 or better.*	
SLO 16: Understand the basic principles of structural behavior.	*CNST 318 Statics and Strength of Materials*	*CNST 318: Quiz #5*	*CNST 318: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 318.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~ *From Spring CNST 318.301: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
		CNST 318: Assignment #6	*CNST 318: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	~~*From Spring CNST 318.10#: 100% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*~~	

					From Spring CNST 318.301: 92.6% of the students scored 70/100 or better.	
SLO 17: Understand the basic principles of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems.	*CNST 213 Environmental Control Systems*	*CNST 213: Project*	*CNST 213: Rubric allotting points*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Fall CNST 213.001: 95.5% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Fall CNST 213.301: 87.5% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	
		CNST 213: Exam 2	*CNST 213: Answer key*	*70% of the students will score 70/100 or better*	*From Fall CNST 213.001: 95.5% of the students scored 70/100 or better.* *From Fall CNST 213.301: 95.8% of the students scored 70/100 or better.*	

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in Blue Reports to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	*The department hired one new faculty member to start Spring 25 and is expected to improve the quality of assessment next year.* *The department is asking for a new 3-yr Instructor to start fall 25 and, if granted, is expected to improve the quality of assessment next year.*

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

1) Cohort Sizes

	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023
Construction Management	23	24	31	29	31	27	25	28	

2) Year-to-Year Retention

	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023
Year 1	23	24	31	29	31	27	25	28	
Year 2	15	15	17	16	21	14	16		
Cohort Retention %	65.22%	62.50%	54.84%	55.17%	67.74%	51.85%	64.00%		

3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023
Cohort Graduates	5	7	6	8					
Cohort Graduation %	21.74%	29.17%	19.35%	27.59%					

4) 4-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023
Cohort Graduates					2				
Cohort Graduation %					6.45%				

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*	*Students need additional support or better preparation in math, geometry and/or some science courses.*
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	*The program has approved and submitted Curriculog proposals to raise the minimum required grade in its CNST courses to C-. It is done to make sure students graduate from program with acceptable level of knowledge and skills in science and construction.*
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	*Some faculty believe that additional in-class activities will be immensely helpful to students' success.*
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	*Each faculty conducted the assessment in his/her own classes (online and on-campus). The results were shared during program meetings.*

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Construction Management BS
Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	I know you may have reported on every LO this year because of the accreditation visit, but generally you can report on them all over a multiyear cycle if that makes it more manageable. It's up to you.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.	Excellent use of multiple measures to provide data for each LO. Good addition of measures of individual mastery where other measures that use data from group projects are used. Good incorporation of rubrics that measure component scores as well as produce composite scores, allowing for accurate reporting of individual LO mastery.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)		Exemplary

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	It seems that 70% as the threshold for proficiency might just be aiming for the minimum, rather than setting reasonably high expectations. <<<Given the sizable nature of the program, it may make sense to disaggregate performance for campus and online students to ensure both are achieving comparable levels of mastery.	Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	<<<It was noted that improvement in math/science courses is vital, which is somewhat supported by the deficiencies noted in the accounting/finance related measures; however, over half of the deficiencies were in other areas not discussed in any plans for improvement (e.g., ethics, methods & materials, and project delivery).	Developing

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2023-24

Unit/Program Name: MS-ECT Program **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Dr. William Clyburn, william.clyburn@indstate.edu

Academic Program:	Master of Science – Electronics & Computer Technology (MS-ECT)	**Date:**	October 21, 2024
Author(s):	Dr. William Clyburn		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Director of Assessment & Program Effectiveness, at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		X Learning Outcomes X Curriculum Map X Assessment Plan	
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students.		_X_ Campus [See Note 3]	

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment For AY 2023-24

SLO #1: Students demonstrate professional level oral communication proficiencies.

- Weight: 10% of assessment rubric
- Assessment Strategies: All students will develop a professional research portfolio on an appropriate topic in the ECT field and develop a defense of the final submission.
- Established Benchmark for Proficiency: 80% (B-Level) effectiveness. [See Note 1]
- Actual Student Performance: 5/5 (100%) achieved the benchmark level [See Note 2]
- Result AY 2023-24: OUTCOME ACHIEVED
- Result AY 2022-23: 3/3 (100%) (OUTCOME ACHIEVED)

SLO #2: Students demonstrate professional level written communication proficiencies.

- Weight: 40% of assessment rubric.
- Assessment Strategies: All students will develop a professional research portfolio on an appropriate topic in the ECT field and develop a defense of the final submission.
- Established Benchmark for Proficiency: 80% (B-Level) effectiveness. [See Note 1]
- Actual Student Performance: 4/5 (80%) achieved the benchmark level [See Note 2]
- Result AY 2023-24: OUTCOME ACHIEVED
- Result AY 2022-23: 3/3 (100%) (OUTCOME ACHIEVED)

SLO #3: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge & skills required in their discipline.

- Weight: 25% of assessment rubric
- Assessment Strategies: All students will develop a professional research portfolio on an appropriate topic in the ECT field and develop a defense of the final submission.
- Established Benchmark for Proficiency: 80% (B-Level) effectiveness. [See Note 1]
- Actual Student Performance: 5/5 (100%) achieved the benchmark level [See Note 2]
- Result AY 2023-24: OUTCOME ACHIEVED
- Result AY 2022-23: 3/3 (100%) (OUTCOME ACHIEVED)

SLO #4: Students demonstrate effective applications of research methodology skills in their discipline.

- Weight: 25% of assessment rubric
- Assessment Strategies: All students will develop a professional research portfolio on an appropriate topic in the ECT field and develop a defense of the final submission.
- Established Benchmark for Proficiency: 80% (B-Level) effectiveness. [See Note 1]
- Actual Student Performance: 5/5 (100%) achieved the benchmark level [See Note 2]
- Result AY 2023-24: OUTCOME ACHIEVED
- Result AY 2022-23: 3/3 (100%) (OUTCOME ACHIEVED)

Notes related to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment For AY 2023-24

NOTE: (1) All of the SLO's evaluated are directly tied to standard outcomes expected of all graduate programs at ISU. The 80% effectiveness threshold represents the minimum level of achievement (3.0 Cumulative GPA) to graduate from a MS program at ISU.
NOTE: (2) The 'n' value shown for evaluation purposes represents an adjusted value of students enrolled in the ECT679 course for AY2023-24. A total of five students were enrolled in two sections of ECT679. The student grade distribution was: A=2; B+=2, B-=1. Student's portfolio submissions and defenses were evaluated by instructor rubric to assess proficiency towards meeting benchmark levels for all SLOs.
NOTE: (3) The MS-ECT is offered as an on-campus and distance format. However, for AY 2023-24 no student enrolled in the ECT697 Major Project course used for distance program evaluation.

Review of Student Success Data & Activities

What indicators are trending positive?
As reported above, the SOAS report for the MS-ECT program is based upon results for five students enrolled in ECT679. Three were from one section evaluated by the MS-ECT Program Coordinator, and two in a separate section evaluated by the ECET Department Chair. Evaluation of the available results are positive in all areas of student outcomes. Discussions by graduate faculty, SIRs evaluations from students, and external review by the ECET Industry Advisory Committee (IAC) remain positive regarding the academic rigor and effectiveness of the MS-ECT program.

What indicators are concerning?
(A) The primary challenge to the MS-ECT program remains low student enrollment. This is a major concern to the faculty and the Department Industrial Advisory Committee.
(B) Maintaining adequate faculty and skillsets in the face of budget tightening. Replacement of retiring faculty and strategy to provide for several faculty who are approaching retirement age; and maintaining industry standards in the ECET field in research.

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes.
Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.
During the 2023-2024 AY the ECET department was restructured to include the Computer Science (CS) program starting with the 2024-2025 AY. As part of an internal review in preparation for the restructuring a curricular review of the graduate program was made as no major revisions had taken place since 2010. Accepting a need for revision and modification to keep in line with changes not only to the department but with the updated mission of the BCET, the graduate faculty submitted a complete revision to terminate the MS-ECT at the end of the 2024-2025 AY which was accepted by the University. Renamed as the MS- Electronics and Computer Engineering Technology (MS-ECET) the replacement program is a better academic match to the restructured ECET Department and the newly designated BCET to better incorporate and leverage the engineering aspect of the college mission. The curricular offerings were expanded to give wider appeal but retain the essential concentrations that have proven popular in the past. The logistics of offering the program were streamlined to make more effective use of available resources. Discussions with students proved positive and a number of students have indicated they will opt to move to the new MS-ECET degree program for the 2025-26 AY.

Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?
The MS- ECET is replacing the MS-ECT, it will have a new concentration in artificial intelligence & machine learning which will leverage both computer engineering technology and computer science components in it. The redesignation of the program as engineering technology is hoped to create appeal among potential students with engineering degrees who seek to continue with advanced degrees within that domain. The opportunity for students with CS undergraduate degrees who wish to move to hybrid MS fields with engineering technology in AI and ML as well as information technology should be enhanced with the new degree and the department restructuring.
Accessibility for students who wish to be distance only is still supported in some of the concentrations (other than automation), and offers students the ability to learn within their schedules.

What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these?
Dr. Xiaolong Li has introduced a proposal which would provide international students from the Peoples Republic of China into our undergraduate program in automation, and Information Technology. If successful an effort will be made to entice some portion of these international students into the MS concentration. One new hire, Dr. Zaidi, has joined the program faculty supporting automation & control.

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?
The same four outcomes are used each year as these are directly tied to standard outcomes expected of all graduate programs at ISU, and are applicable to all students in the program regardless of concentration. The assessment strategy is patterned upon the strategy required by ABET-ETAC for nationally recognized accreditation of the undergraduate engineering technology programs in the BCET. While ABET does not accredit MS programs, the use of an existing and understood strategy which is consistent with a national accrediting agency specifically for engineering technology programs is seen as an effective model to emulate for the MS program. The assessment strategy will be carried forward with implementation of the MS-ECET.

Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?
Results of assessment activity are made available to department faculty, and are discussed in roundtable meetings with the Department Industrial Advisory Council. This follows accreditation procedures required by ABET-ETAC.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. (i.e.: what has been learned? What questions have been raised? Is there a comparison between past and present performance? Future actions?)

1) Graduation rates indicate students are achieving academic success in the program. The overall effectiveness of the MS program is supported by student evaluations, internal review by faculty, and external review by the ECET Industrial Advisory Council (IAC). The program faculty are satisfied with the curriculum, rollout, and evaluation methodology at this time.

2) The areas of concern with regard to evaluation are:
Written communications proficiency remains an area of concern for student difficulty as many of the students are internationals.

3) Comparison & future actions:
Conclusive comparison of performance is hampered by the use of low numbers making statistical evaluations difficult. Examination of the data available does not support concern for student performance at this point. The adoption of the program restructuring is a primary concern for the Department along with increasing student enrollment.

Summary:
Based upon the input by MS-ECT students, graduate faculty, and the IAC the ECET Department feel that the program is providing appropriate student outcomes. Concerns are present which require monitoring and additional data, particularly due to low numbers used in the evaluations, but that current evaluation methodology and assessment rubrics are effective for this purpose. The successful upcoming rollout of the renamed and curriculum expanded program is the focus of the graduate faculty.
//WWC 10/21/2024

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Electronics & Computer Technology MS

Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)		Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)	Given the small enrollment numbers, this assessment strategy missed documenting distance student mastery of these LOs. Are there enough students in that cohort that this is of concern, or is it likely that assessing these same LOs again next year will capture data representing the distance learning experience? If not, it may be worthwhile to identify additional measures in other courses to use when there are similar gaps to fill.	Mature

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described		Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Mature

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Engineering Technology Management	**Date:**	11/21/2024
Author(s):	Randy Peters		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus _X__ Distance ___ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison from 21-22 assessment year**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
(1) an ability to apply knowledge, techniques, skills and modern tools of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology to solve broadly-defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline;	ET 499 Senior Project	Rubric for major Project Exit Survey	Senior project rubric. Outcomes 1, 2 & 4 are measured on the same rubric. Exit Survey	Scores avg > 85% Exit Survey average >3.0 (5.0 scale)	218 out of 240 on the rubric for 91% Exit Survey not given in 2024	N/A-different methods were used in the last cycle. The methods were changed to a rubric to evaluate the outcome due to feedback from the program's accreditation process and prior outcome assessments.
(4) an ability to conduct standard tests, measurements, and experiments and to analyze and interpret the results to improve processes; and	ET 499 Senior Project	Rubric for major Project Exit Survey	Senior project rubric. Outcomes 1, 2 & 4 are measured on the same rubric. Exit Survey	Scores avg > 85% Exit Survey average >3.0 (5.0 scale)	218 out of 240 on the rubric for 91% Exit Survey not given in 2024	N/A-different methods were used in the last cycle. CTM exam scores average = 68% Exit Survey = 3.9
(5) an ability to function effectively as a member as well as a leader on technical teams.	ET 499 Senior Project	Senior project assignment, including report and presentation	Teamwork Rubric Exit Survey	Teamwork Rubric avg >26 (out of 36) Exit Survey average >3.0 (5.0 scale)	Teamwork Rubric = 32 Exit Survey not given in 2024	Teamwork Rubric = 31 N/A-different methods were used in the last cycle. CTM exam scores average = 72% Exit Survey = 3.5

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	• As stated in the previous assessment, this program is meant for distance, part-time, fully employed, transfer students with an ABET accredited associate degree (or an associate that meets ABET curriculum requirements). Substantive changes were made to the program over the past three years due to feedback from the program's advisory committee, accreditation process, and prior outcomes assessment reviews. A similar program (engineering technology) was suspended, and those students have been directed to this program (engineering technology management). The new advising methods and the new curriculum are working well. The program's numbers are growing.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	• Enrollment continues to grow.
What student success indicators are concerning?	• There are no indicators that are concerning. We do need to strive to continually collect assessment data.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	• It is worth noting that the ETM program is ostensibly a 2+2 degree with very few freshmen. As primarily a degree completion program, with enrollment of 43 students it is tied for the 10th largest undergraduate program in the BCET. Even though it is relatively a new program, it has already graduated 42 students in 5 years, placing it 12th overall in the BCET for this category.

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	• The program was changed significantly a few short years ago and assessment data, which is primarily collected in the senior year, has not yet captured those students. Therefore, we are still collecting data and monitoring to accurately assess those students when they graduate in the upcoming cycles.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	• The program is meant to be an on-line degree completion degree. However, the administration admits both on-campus and first-year students; this leads to issues with scheduling and the discontent of students (both on-line and on-campus) because they cannot get the courses via the mode they desire. • Because the great majority of people in the program are on-line degree completion students, they desire and need courses in the summer—however, every year the administration further restricts summer offerings.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request*	

for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).	
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Per the assessment plan, next year we will focus on SOs 2 and 3.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	The ET 499 instructor, with the assistance of the Department Chair, is the primary person to ensure the outcomes assessment data are collected. The Department Chair and the program faculty analyze the data and complete all outcomes assessment, accreditation, marketing, advising, and other program activities. The Program Team Faculty participated in the review of the data and the creation of this report.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Engineering Technology Management BS

Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LOs are compound, which make them hard to measure in full. If associated assessment tools are complex enough to analyze each aspect of the LOs, this is not an issue.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.	Good clarification on how multiple LOs are measured using the same rubric.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)	Does the teamwork rubric measure a student's ability to be both an effective leader and member of a team, as stated in the LO? Note for ABET – If the Senior Project is a group project, it may be necessary to add assessments of individual mastery of these LOs for accreditation compliance.	Mature

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used ***– to an extent; see notes*** Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	<<The data, as reported, seem to reflect the composite score on the rubric, rather than component scores that align with and isolate measures of LO1 and LO4 separately. For LO assessment purposes, these component scores should be reported separately for each LO. The advantage of an analytical rubric is that it allows for this data to be easily reported.	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	The program is indicated to be a distance program, but is described in Part 3 as both on-campus and distance. This probably needs to be a priority for ongoing discussion with Enrollment Management and Academic Affairs if this is creating concern. What is the plan to address these issues?	Developing

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Interior Architecture Design (IAD)	**Date:**	November 15, 2024
Author(s):	Kimberly Smith		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	_x__ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
4a: Students understand that human and environmental conditions vary according to geographic location and impact design and construction decisions.	IAD 354 (FA2023)	Test 1	Test 1 covered architecture and interiors that were designed based upon climate and geographic locations as well as motifs, architecture, interiors, furnishings and historical aspects of each era.	70% of 70%	53% - goal not met; Improve lectures and discussion emphasizing the context of information in relation to architecture and interiors.	Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.
4a: Students understand that human and environmental conditions vary according to geographic location and impact design and construction decisions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document	Students do research on their location, climate, context, and how it informs their design. Students were also asked to select an alternate global location and analyze their project and design in relation to what would change.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; The majority of students did a good contextual analysis, showing understanding. Moving forward, should make this analysis a separate earlier assignment with infographics or diagrams to show awareness, understanding, and even application.	Context -76% Global - 47%; The majority of students did a good contextual analysis, showing understanding. Seven students did not do the alternate global assignment. Moving forward, should make this analysis a separate earlier assignment with infographics or diagrams to show awareness,

						understanding, and even application.
4c: Student work demonstrates understanding of how systems thinking informs the practice of interior	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Integrate an activity within process reviews.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.
4e: The interior design program provides exposure to a variety of cultural norms.	IAD 354 (FA2023)	Test 3	Test 3 covered units of a design eras; cover motifs, architecture, interiors, furnishings and historical aspects of each era.	70% of 70%	77% - goal met; will continue to improve lecture and discussion emphasizing specific information in relation to architecture and interiors.	Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.
5a: Students have awareness that multiple disciplines and stakeholders are involved in creating an interior environment.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - integrated Practices	Rubric. Integrated design practice - Students must explain other disciples they will work with to assist in their design. Description, infographic, and application required.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; 12 of 17 students had 70% or above, 4 students did not complete this section and one student was missing details. Many over thought this and doing it as an in-class exercise prior to final submittal may be of value and provide good discussion	Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.
5a: Students have awareness that multiple disciplines and stakeholders are involved in creating an interior environment.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document	Students research budget information and include the appropriate industry professionals that would be included in this project.		71% - goal met; Create a separate in-class exercise focusing on integrated design professionals - connect with Professional Practices	Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.
5d: Students understand the dynamics of team collaboration and the distribution and structure of team responsibilities.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Group Presentations	At each process review, students are sorted into small groups for critiques and collaboration.	70% of 70%	88% - goal met; Structure the critiques more, where each student has a specific role similar to a design firm.	Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.

5d: Students understand the dynamics of team collaboration and the distribution and structure of team responsibilities.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quiz 03	Lesson 06 Presentation	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Could further discuss hiring consultants	Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.
5e: Student work demonstrates the ability to effectively collaborate with multiple disciplines in developing design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Mentor/Model Client Meeting Minutes	Students met with a mentor (design professional) and model client (professional within their project types) and discussed their design intentions. These design moves were informed by their meetings and implemented into their Process Reviews	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Have students note where they made these intentional design moves after meeting minutes are completed.	89%; Majority of students fulfilled the requirement; continue to give time for research and conducting site visits/interviews; two students did not do well due to distance as well as not completing the assignment
6a: Students have awareness of the contexts for interior design practice.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quiz 01	Lesson 02 + Lesson 05 Presentations active site visits, document reviews throughout all phases of design	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Keeping up to date with the how practices evolve and get better	Prior results are not available for this standard.
6b: Students have awareness of the impact of regional and global markets on design practices.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Boards - Specialization	Rubric. Specialization - does student use research on specialization and on the impact their project can have.	70% of 70%	100% - goal met; Continue to require students to do in-depth research and site visits to understand their specialization and how to design for it. Have discussion and specific applications related to the global market and interior design's impact.	Prior results are not available for this standard.
6b: Students have awareness of the impact of regional and global markets on design practices.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document	Students do research on their location, climate, context, and how it informs their design. Students were also asked to select an alternate global location and analyze their project and		82% - goal met; The majority of students did a good contextual analysis, showing understanding. Moving forward, should make this analysis a separate earlier assignment with	Prior results are not available for this standard.

			design in relation to what would change.		infographics or diagrams to show awareness, understanding, and even application.	
6c: Students have awareness of the breadth and depth of interior design's impact and value.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Boards - Specialization	Rubric. Specialization - does student use research on specialization and on the impact their project can have.	70% of 70%	100% - goal met; Continue to require students to do in-depth research and site visits to understand their specialization and how to design for it. Have discussion and specific application related to the global market and interior design's impact.	Prior results are not available for this standard.
6c: Students have awareness of the breadth and depth of interior design's impact and value.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Exercise 2	Photo study exercise documenting everyday lives of specific users and how designers can impact their lives	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Incorporate a reflection essay specifically describing the interior designers impact and value.	Prior results are not available for this standard.
6c: Students have awareness of the breadth and depth of interior design's impact and value.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quizzes, RFP, Trip Paper	All Lesson Presentations, RFP Final Project, + Grand Rapids Trip Paper	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Have other design professionals (architects, engineers, etc.) discuss the importance of their symbiotic relationship	Prior results are not available for this standard.
6d: Students have awareness of the components and responsibilities of business practice.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quiz 02 + 03	Lesson 03 + Lesson 06 Presentations	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; This information could be broken apart further and be less intermingled in other presentations	A #1 = 93.3% A #3 = 86.6% A #5 = 93.3% E #1 = 73.3% E #2 = 80% E #3 = 60~~%~~ Continue to have students work on writing/reporting on business practices. Consider implementing more individual student work and less group/team work to ensure all students are

						demonstrating this understanding. Consider adding questions in the exams on human recourses.
6e: Students understand types of professional business formations.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quiz 01	Lesson 01 Presentation	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Lesson could be taken further by introducing and discussing business plans	A #3 = 86.6% A #5 = 93.3% E #3 = 60% Continue to have students create a business plan as individuals and not as teams. Consider implementing more individual student work and less group/team work to ensure all students are demonstrating this understanding. Consider adding questions in Assignment #1 and Exam #2 of hybrid and consultancy types of business formation.
6f: Students understand elements of project management.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quizzes	Lesson 03 + Lesson 05 Presentations Continuous discussions of the Phases of Design	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Working hard with the students to help them understand that their job isn't complete after the final design presentation. It has only just began.	A #3 = 86.6% A #4 = 80% A #5 = 93.3% E #2 = 80% E #3 = 60% Continue to have students work on assignments #3 and consider incorporating more specific questions regarding projections. Consider implementing more individual student work and less group/team work (#3 & #5).

						Consider adding more focused questions in the exams on projections.
6g: Students understand instrument of service.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
6h: Students understand professional ethics and conduct.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quiz 01	Lesson 02	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Could have a professional ethics speaker	A #1 = 93.3% A #2 = 73.3% A #3 = 86.6% Final Paper = 93.3~~%~~ E #1 = 73.3% E #2 = 80% E #3 = 60% Continue to have students focus on professional ethics and conduct in the assignments (as listed), the exams, and final paper. Consider more individual student submissions to ensure all student are demonstrating this understanding.
6i: The interior design program provides exposure to career opportunities an interior designer education can afford and the options for advance study.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Grand Rapids Paper	Grand Rapids Trip - Paper	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Guest speaker from an atypical design professional	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
6j: The interior design program provides exposure to role models who are qualified by education and experience in interior design.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Discussion Board	Active construction site visits where they saw designer-client-GC interaction; Guest Speaker, Sara Knies who recently passed the NCIDQ	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Have other design professionals (architects, engineers, etc.) discuss the importance of their symbiotic relationship	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
6k: The interior design program provides exposure to the role and value of	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

legal recognition for the profession.						
6k: The interior design program provides exposure to the role and value of legal recognition for the profession.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Discussion Board	Guest Speaker, Sara Knies who recently passed the NCIDQ - we discussed the importance of legislation (especially in Indiana)	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; talk to out of State professionals who can discuss how legislation has changed the value of their roles	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
6l: The interior design program provides exposure to the role and value of professional organizations.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	In class discussion	Lesson 07 with online video - DEI in the Workplace	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Have the University's DEI Representative come and speak	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
6m: The interior design program provides exposure to the role and value of life-long learning.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quiz 01	Lesson 01 Presentation	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; Virtually attend a IIAD (or other org.) meeting	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
6n: The interior design program provides exposure to the role and value of public service.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Quiz 01	Guest Speaker, Sara Knies who recently passed the NCIDQ - we discussed continuing education	70% of 70%	Average grade above 80%; goal met; require them to take a CEU online	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
7a: Student work demonstrates understanding of theories related to the impact of the built environment on human experience, behavior, and performance.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Theory	Rubric. Theory research and infographic. Students research a theory create an infographic and discuss how it will inform their design	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Some students missed the application piece of how it will inform their design, ensure this is understood and applied to final items.	89%; Majority of students fulfilled the requirement; continue to give time for research and conducting site visits/interviews; two students did not do well due to distance as well as not completing the assignment
7a: Student work demonstrates understanding of theories related to the impact of the built environment on human experience, behavior, and performance.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentations	Students include written summaries of their theories and where they are incorporated within their plans and design.	70% of 70%	64% - goal not met; Incorporate a section on theories within the process reviews. Students had their theories and descriptions but not all connected it back to their plans.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
7b: Student work demonstrates	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Boards - Wellness	Rubric. Wellness & goals. Students should	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Several students neglected to	89%; Majority of students fulfilled the

understanding of the relationship between the designed environment and human experience, wellbeing, behavior, and performance.			incorporate wellness into their design, executed and communicated throughout boards		include how this was done or provide sufficient notes to explain. Must work with student on notes and communicating on presentation boards.	assignment; two students did not complete the assignment. Give future guidance on how to create matrix
7b: Student work demonstrates understanding of the relationship between the designed environment and human experience, wellbeing, behavior, and performance.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	PR1, Thesis Document	Experience Plans and Thesis Document includes written summaries of the human experience, wellbeing, behavior, and performance.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Include WELL standards within process reviews on experience plans	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
7c: Student work demonstrates the ability to gather and apply human-centered evidence.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Boards - Specialization	Rubric. Specialization - does student use research on specialization to create a human centered solution	70% of 70%	100% - goal met; Continue to require students to do in-depth research and site visits to understand their specialization and how to design for it. Continue working on notes and communication on presentation boards.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
7c: Student work demonstrates the ability to gather and apply human-centered evidence.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Thesis Document	Process Reviews include connections back to their research in Fall semester. Thesis Document records the findings and additional site visits.	70% of 70%	Process Reviews - 82% - goal met; Thesis Document - 24% - goal not met; Process Reviews can be adapted to include additional site visits and interviews. It was optional this class and majority of the students did not incorporate. Include assignment for how to implement findings.	PR2 POE - 88% Binder Design Theories- 76%; POE assignment can be adapted to include conceptual information, showing infographics or diagrams and showing how they will plan to apply the evidence to their project. Several students failed to do some of the theories in the research document. Having the research done prior to diving into design and showing how they plan to apply it will be a

						more efficient approach to their design.
7d: Student work demonstrates the ability to analyze and synthesize human perception and behavior patterns to inform design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Boards - Specialization	Rubric. Specialization - does student use research on specialization to create a human centered solution	70% of 70%	100% - goal met; Continue to require students to do in depth research and site visits to understand their specialization and how to design for it. Continue working on notes and communication on presentation boards.	89%; Majority of students fulfilled the requirement; continue to give time for research and conducting site visits/interviews; two students did not do well due to distance as well as not completing the assignment
7d: Student work demonstrates the ability to analyze and synthesize human perception and behavior patterns to inform design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	In-class Exercises	Photo study and graphic thesis statement to analyze how their designs are perceived.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Incorporate a reflection essay specifically describing the interior designers impact and value.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
7e: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply human factors, ergonomics, inclusive, and universal design principles to design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research doc - UD	Rubric. Universal Design diagram. Students should provide diagrams of how their project incorporated UD principles.	70% of 70%	65% - goal not met; Several students incorrectly showed application of the principles. Suggest incorporating into class exercise and discussion early in semester so students can think about how designing for it.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
7e: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply human factors, ergonomics, inclusive, and universal design principles to design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentations/Thesis Doc	Within final boards and presentation students incorporate their findings and designs. Thesis Document lists these specifically with 3-5 design moves that included these.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Include within a process review these findings early on to assist with students incorporating into their presentations.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
7f: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply wayfinding	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in-depth work	83%; Majority of students completed assignment; three students did not

techniques to design solutions.			this final design and connections.		throughout semester during design process.	present well and presentation boards were not complete; work with students to make sure understanding and follow through on completion
7f: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply wayfinding techniques to design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentations/Thesis Doc	Within final boards and presentation students incorporate their findings and designs. Thesis Document lists these specifically with 3-5 design moves that included these.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Include within a process review these findings early on to assist with students incorporating into their presentations.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8a: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply space planning techniques throughout the design process.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in-depth work throughout semester during design process.	72%; 5 students did not complete the assignment (missing diagrams, etc.); have more thorough reviews of project binders and make sure students understand requirements.
8a: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply space planning techniques throughout the design process.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews	Process reviews include adjacency matrix, bubble diagrams, block diagrams, and schematic plans prior to final design.	70% of 70%	88%- goal met; Emphasize these techniques by incorporating theories and concept early and making connections.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8b: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to solve progressively complex design problems.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in-depth work throughout semester during design process.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8b: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to solve progressively complex design problems.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Final Boards	Process reviews focus on research related to their project as a whole, including analysis, synthesis, and application. Final boards include final	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design.	Binder Schematics - 100% Final Boards 71%; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and

			design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on communication of the design story.			application of ideas into their final design.
8c: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to identify and define issues relevant to the design problem.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in-depth work throughout semester during design process.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8c: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to identify and define issues relevant to the design problem.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Final Boards	Process reviews focus on research related to their project as a whole, including analysis, synthesis, and application. Final boards include final design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on communication of the design story.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design.	Binder Schematics - 100% Final Boards 71%; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design.
8d: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to synthesize information to generate evidenced-based design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in depth work throughout semester during design process.	78%; Four students did not complete all aspects of the project/assignments; assess process reviews and project binder reviews more thoroughly; go through presentation prep more thoroughly
8d: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to synthesize information to generate evidenced-based design solutions	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Final Boards	Process reviews focus on research related to their project as a whole, including analysis, synthesis, and application. Final boards include final design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will	Binder - 76% Final Boards - 71%; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to

			communication of the design story.		form their concept and design.	design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will form their concept and design.
8e: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to use of precedents to inform design concepts or solutions.	IAD 354 (FA2023)	Final Design Project	Final design project included selecting two objects and placing them within a museum exhibit; class worked together to create a cohesive project and presentation	70% of 70%	100% - goal met; continue to improve parameters of the project and encourage more collaborative design.	Prior results are not available for this standard due to accreditation standard change; this is the first time assessing this standard.
8e: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to use of precedents to inform design concepts or solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR2 & PR3	Rubrics. Process Review 2 - site visit or interview. Process Review 3 - two site visits and interview complete with application	70% of 70%	88% & 100% - goals met; Continue requiring site visits and interviews related to specialization. Make sure is announced early and encourage them to do them sooner to help with program, PR2, two students did not do them and projects suffered long term.	78%; Four students did not complete all aspects of the project/assignments; assess process reviews and project binder reviews more thoroughly; go through presentation prep more thoroughly
8e: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to use of precedents to inform design concepts or solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews	Process reviews show student work through various design stages each building on the previous.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Add a section for students to notate where their design concepts and ideas are being applied/implemented.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8f: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to explore and iterate multiple ideas.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR3	Rubric. Process Review 3 - three unique sets of block diagrams.	70% of 70%	88% - goal met; Continue to require three sets of blocks. Ensure students are exploring multiple ideas even in blocks and including vertical circulation.	78%; Four students did not complete all aspects of the project/assignments; assess process reviews and project binder reviews more thoroughly; go through presentation prep more thoroughly

8f: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to explore and iterate multiple ideas.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews	Process reviews show student work through various design stages each building on the previous.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Add a section for students to notate where their design concepts and ideas are being applied/implemented.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8g: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to design creative and effective solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in creative solutions they have developed.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8g: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to design creative and effective solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards	Final boards include final design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on communication of the design story.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will form their concept and design.	Binder - 76% Final Boards - 71%; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will form their concept and design.
8h: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to execute the design process: pre-design, quantitative and qualitative programming, schematic design, and design development.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR1-PR5	Rubrics. Process Reviews 1-5 totals. Each PR is for a different part of the design process.	70% of 70%	88%, 76%, 88%, 65%, 88% - goal met (PR 1-3,5); not met (PR 4); PR4 is the one that students did not do well on, this is the one where they had to have a finalized plan, perspectives, RCP. Six students had less than 70% and each one of them struggled with final boards. Encourage students with previous PR to explore, finalize and move forward, the problems occurred	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

					prior to PR4. These students had lowest grades in course. PR4 transitions to computer. consider breaking up requirements.	
8h: Student work demonstrates the ability to apply knowledge and skills learned to execute the design process: pre-design, quantitative and qualitative programming, schematic design, and design development.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards	Final boards include final design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on communication of the design story.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will form their concept and design.	Binder PDI - 88% Final Boards - 71%; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will form their concept and design.
8i: Students understand the importance of evaluating the relevance and reliability of information and research impacting design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR1 & PR2	Rubrics. Process Reviews 1 & 2 totals. These focus on research and collecting information on specialization, theory, and how to apply information to their project.	70% of 70%	88% & 76% - goal met; Provide clearer instructions for specialization research and them digging into information. Ensure connection between initial research here isn't lost when it comes to applying to design.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8i: Students understand the importance of evaluating the relevance and reliability of information and research impacting design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews	Various exercises connected to previous thesis research implemented within schematic design phase.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Have students specifically list items to ensure they understand the importance of evaluating the relevance of certain information.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8j: The interior design program includes exposure to a range of problem	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR1-PR5	Rubrics. Process Reviews 1-5 totals. Each PR is for a different part of the design process.	70% of 70%	88%, 76%, 88%, 65%, 88% - goal met (PR 1-3,5); not met (PR 4); PR4 is the one that students did not do	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

identification and problem-solving methods.					well on, this is the one where they had to have a finalized plan, perspectives, RCP. Six students had less than 70% and each one of them struggled with final boards. Encourage students with previous PR to explore, finalize and move forward, the problems occurred prior to PR4. These students had lowest grades in course. PR4 transitions to computer. consider breaking up requirements.	
8j: The interior design program includes exposure to a range of problem identification and problem-solving methods.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews	Various exercises connected to previous thesis research implemented within schematic design phase.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Have students specifically list items to ensure they understand the importance of evaluating the relevance of certain information.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8k: The interior design program includes opportunities for innovation and risk taking.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR1	Rubric. Process Review 1 - concept development.	70% of 70%	94% - goal met; Provide clearer discussion about concept and connect back to elements and principles of design and IAD 151, push their thinking. Try early model making in class.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8k: The interior design program includes opportunities for innovation and risk taking.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
8l: The interior design program includes exposure to methods of idea generation and design thinking.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR4	Rubric. Process Review 4 - ideation sketches. 13 out of 17 students scored over 70%. Two students did not do any ideation sketches	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Concept development sketches were required in earlier PR and ideation with notes required in PR4. Ensure students are adding notes.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

			and two students completed less than half		Consider having some due earlier so they are exploring and preparing ideas before.	
8l: The interior design program includes exposure to methods of idea generation and design thinking.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Group Presentations	At each process review, students are sorted into small groups for critiques and collaboration.	70% of 70%	88% - goal met; Structure the critiques more, where each student has a specific role similar to a design firm.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9a: Students are able to effectively interpret and communicate data and research.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR1 & PR2	Rubrics. Process Reviews 1 & 2 totals. These focus on research and collecting information on specialization, theory, and how to apply information to their project.	70% of 70%	88% & 76% - goals met; provide clearer instructions for specialization research and them digging into information. Ensure connection between initial research here isn't lost when comes to applying to design.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9a: Students are able to effectively interpret and communicate data and research.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards	Final boards include final design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on communication of the design story.	70% of 70%	Final Boards - 71% - goal met; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will form their concept and design.	Binder - 76% Final Boards - 71%; Incorporate more concept development, more infographics, diagrams, and application of ideas into their final design. Having students focus on research prior to design and pulling out a lot of the key elements that will form their concept and design.
9a: Students are able to effectively interpret and communicate data and research.	IAD 458 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9b: Students are able to effectively express ideas and their rationale in oral communication.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Presentation	Rubric. Final Presentation.	70% of 70%	100% - goal met; All students presented their final project to class and jurors. Consider making	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

					mock pin ups an actual presentation to the class like a TEDTalk to get them more comfortable.	
9b: Students are able to effectively express ideas and their rationale in oral communication.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Presentation	Students express their ideas and rationale during their final presentation with their boards and PowerPoint as assistance.	70% of 70%	88% - goal met; Create mini presentations during the semester to help integrate final communication.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9c: Students are able to effectively express ideas and their rationale in written communication.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Boards	Rubric - Final Presentation Boards - Board layout & communication.	70% of 70%	94% - goal met; While the majority of students scored over 70% on this item, many of them neglected to communicate well on individual drawings and items. Incorporate notes and communication techniques throughout PR to ensure they end up on final boards. Help them make the connections.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9c: Students are able to effectively express ideas and their rationale in written communication.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Thesis Document	Students express their ideas and rationale during their final boards and thesis document going into more detail.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Have students complete items within thesis document throughout the semester to help integrate items into their presentation/boards.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9d: Students are able to effectively express ideas developed in the design process through visual media: ideation drawings and sketches.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR4	Rubric. Process Review 4 - ideation sketches. 13 out of 17 students scored over 70%. Two students did not do any ideation sketches and two students completed less than half	70% of 70%	76%- goal met; Concept development sketches were required in earlier PR and ideation with notes required in PR4. Ensure students are adding notes. Consider having some due earlier so they are exploring and preparing ideas before.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9d: Students are able to effectively express ideas developed in the design process through visual	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews	Various process reviews include students to sketch their ideas and note	70% of 70%	94% - goal met; Include more of these within final boards and presentations.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

media: ideation drawings and sketches.			where the concept and theory is being shown.			
9e: Students are able to effectively express project solutions using a variety of visual communication techniques and technologies appropriate to a range of purposes and audiences.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR4-diagrams	Rubric. Process Review 4 - Vertical & Horizontal Diagrams & 11x17 Diagrams	70% of 70%	88% & 76% & 46% - goal met/not met; Students create diagrams to show circulation, some did not complete these, again concerns about this PR. Students do several infographics in course and do well on these. 11x17 Diagrams is first attempt at these for final and several students did not attempt to do them and several were incorrect and not corrected. Consider doing in class as exercises to walk them through what is needed.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9e: Students are able to effectively express project solutions using a variety of visual communication techniques and technologies appropriate to a range of purposes and audiences.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentations	Students create project boards encompassing plans, elevations, renderings that use various programs to create while also preparing a digital presentation that they perform in person and over Zoom.	70% of 70%	88% - goal met; Incorporate inclusion of Adobe programs - Illustrator, InDesign, etc.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9f: The interior design program provides opportunities for exposure to evolving communication technologies.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Final Boards	Rubric - Final Presentation Boards - Perspectives.	70% of 70%	94% - goal met; Final perspectives are done in rendering software by most students. Minimal use of evolving communication techniques. Need to figure out how to better do this.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9f: The interior design program provides opportunities for exposure	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentations	Students create project boards encompassing plans, elevations, renderings that use	70% of 70%	88% - goal met; Incorporate inclusion of Adobe programs - Illustrator, InDesign, etc.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

to evolving communication technologies.			various programs to create while also preparing a digital presentation that they perform in person and over Zoom.			
9g: The interior design program provides opportunities for students to develop active listening skills in the context of professional collaboration.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	PR2 & PR3	Rubrics. Process Review 2 - site visit or interview. Process Review 3 - two site visits and interview complete with application	70% of 70%	88% & 100% - goal met; Continue requiring site visits and interviews related to specialization. Make sure is announced early and encourage them to do them sooner to help with program, PR2, two students did not do them and projects suffered long term.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
9g: The interior design program provides opportunities for students to develop active listening skills in the context of professional collaboration.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Mentor/ Model Client Meeting Minutes	Students meet throughout the semester with a design professional and a professional within their project scope to help guide their designs.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Have students schedule their mentor/ model client meetings at the beginning of the semester. Include line item within meeting minutes of how students will implement ideas from professional.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
10a: Students understand the basic context and framework of history as it relates to interior design	IAD 354 (FA2023)	Test 1-4	Tests 1-4 covered units of a design eras; cover motifs, architecture, interiors, furnishings and historical aspects of each era.	70% of 70%	75% - met goal; room for much improvement, especially lectures and discussion, emphasizing the topics/context of information in relation to architecture and interiors.	Prior assessment (SP2020) has 93% meeting goal; difference was short quizzes instead of lengthy test. It is thought that a more robust test was needed to really assess the student's knowledge of the topic
10b: Students understand the basic context and framework of history as it relates to furniture,	IAD 354 (FA2023)	Test 1-4	Tests 1-4 covered units of a design eras; cover motifs, architecture, interiors, furnishings and	70% of 70%	75% - met goal; room for much improvement, especially lectures and discussion, emphasizing the topics/context of	Prior assessment (SP2020) has 93% meeting goal; difference was short quizzes instead of

decorative arts, and material culture			historical aspects of each era.		information in relation to architecture and interiors.	lengthy test. It is thought that a more robust test was needed to really assess the student's knowledge of the topic
10c: Students understand the basic context and framework of history as it relates to architecture	IAD 354 (FA2023)	Test 1-4	Tests 1-4 covered units of a design eras; cover motifs, architecture, interiors, furnishings and historical aspects of each era.	70% of 70%	75% - met goal; room for much improvement, especially lectures and discussion, emphasizing the topics/context of information in relation to architecture and interiors.	Prior assessment (SP2020) has 93% meeting goal; difference was short quizzes instead of lengthy test. It is thought that a more robust test was needed to really assess the student's knowledge of the topic
10e: Students understand the social, political, and physical influences affecting historical changes in design of the built environment.	IAD 354 (FA2023)	Test 1	Test 1 covered architecture and interiors that were designed based upon climate and geographic locations as well as motifs, architecture, interiors, furnishings and historical aspects of each era.	70% of 70%	53% - did not meet goal; Improve lectures and discussion emphasizing the context of information in relation to architecture and interiors.	Prior assessment (SP2020) has 93% meeting goal; difference was short quizzes instead of lengthy test. It is thought that a more robust test was needed to really assess the student's knowledge of the topic. In addition, the standard changed its meaning/context from 2020 to 2023.
10e: Students understand the social, political, and physical influences affecting historical changes in design of the built environment.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Typo in Curriculum Matrix; this standard not assessed in this course.	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
10e: Students understand the social, political, and physical influences affecting historical changes	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

in design of the built environment.						
11a: Students understand the elements and principles of design, including spatial definition and organization.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
11a: Students understand the elements and principles of design, including spatial definition and organization.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
11b: Students work demonstrates the ability to explore a range of two- and three-dimensional design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in-depth work throughout semester during design process.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
11b: Students work demonstrates the ability to explore a range of two- and three-dimensional design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Final Boards	Various design exercises that include elevations, plans, and perspectives to showcase design solutions.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Students must define, describe, and graphically show how they have incorporated elements and principles into their design. The final boards were evaluated for visual presentation, layout and creativity	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
11c: Students effectively apply the elements and principles of design and related theories throughout the interior design curriculum to two-dimensional design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in-depth work throughout semester during design process.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
11c: Students effectively apply the elements and principles of design and related theories throughout the interior design curriculum to two-dimensional design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Final Boards	Process reviews shows progression to produce a successful final design utilizing elements and principles of design and theories.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Students must define, describe, and graphically show how they have incorporated elements and principles into their design. The final boards were evaluated for visual presentation, layout and creativity	Binder EPT - 65%, Final Board VP - 94%; Incorporate more concept development with a focus on element and principles of design they want to focus on. Having the concept development

						and elements and principles include infographics, diagrams, more ideation, and including an exercise on how it translate to final presentation or boards.
11c: Students effectively apply the elements and principles of design and related theories throughout the interior design curriculum to two-dimensional design solutions.	IAD 470	Standard not assessed; adjunct taught class, did not complete assessment when requested.		70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
11d: Students effectively apply the elements and principles of design and related theories throughout the interior design curriculum to three-dimensional design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards	Rubric. Final Presentation boards. Show final design, tells story of design process and how got to this final design and connections.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue working with student on notes and communication of the in depth work throughout semester during design process.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
11d: Students effectively apply the elements and principles of design and related theories throughout the interior design curriculum to three-dimensional design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Process Reviews, Final Boards	Process reviews shows progression to produce a successful final design utilizing elements and principles of design and theories.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Students must define, describe, and graphically show how they have incorporated elements and principles into their design. The final boards were evaluated for visual presentation, layout and creativity	Binder EPT - 65%, Final Renderings - 100%; Incorporate more concept development with a focus on element and principles of design they want to focus on. Having the concept development and elements and principles include infographics, diagrams, more ideation, and including an exercise on how it translate to final design and renderings. Have students pick their

						perspective views early on and then work to develop them based on E&P and concept.
12a: Students are aware of the environmental impact of illumination strategies and decisions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12a: Students are aware of the environmental impact of illumination strategies and decisions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12b: Students understand the principles of natural and artificial lighting design.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research - Lighting	Rubric - Research Document - Lighting Diagram & description.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Diagram for daylighting shows little to no variation. Students do research and show application written but not graphically. No modulation of light or explanation about luminaire selection. Consider dedicating a few classes to discussing and applying this to their designs.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12b: Students understand the principles of natural and artificial lighting design.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12c: Students understand strategies for using and modulating natural light.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research - Lighting	Rubric - Research Document - Lighting Diagram & description.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Diagram for daylighting shows little to no variation. Students do research and show application written but not graphically. No modulation of light or explanation about luminaire selection. Consider dedicating a few classes to discussing and applying this to their designs.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

12c: Students understand strategies for using and modulating natural light.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12d: Students appropriately select and apply luminaires and light sources	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research - Lighting	Rubric - Research Document - Lighting Diagram & description.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Diagram for daylighting shows little to no variation. Students do research and show application written but not graphically. No modulation of light or explanation about luminaire selection. Consider dedicating a few classes to discussing and applying this to their designs.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12d: Students appropriately select and apply luminaires and light sources	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students create a lighting plan locating and specifying appropriate fixtures.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate a lighting activity within process reviews to solidify lighting terminology, types, and locations.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12e: Students understand how light and color impact health, safety, and wellbeing in the interior environment.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research - Lighting	Rubric - Research Document - Lighting Diagram & description.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Diagram for daylighting shows little to no variation. Students do research and show application written but not graphically. No modulation of light or explanation about luminaire selection. Consider dedicating a few classes to discussing and applying this to their designs.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12e: Students understand how light and color impact health, safety, and wellbeing in the interior environment.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12f: Students have awareness of a range of sources for information and research about color.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

12f: Students have awareness of a range of sources for information and research about color.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12g: Student work demonstrates the understanding of color terminology.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12g: Student work demonstrates the understanding of color terminology.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12g: Student work demonstrates the understanding of color terminology.	IAD 470 (FA2023)	Standard not assessed; adjunct taught class, did not complete assessment when requested.		70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12h: Student work demonstrates the understanding of color principles, theories, and systems.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12h: Student work demonstrates the understanding of color principles, theories, and systems.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12i: Student work demonstrates the understanding of color in relation to materials, textures, light, and form.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12i: Student work demonstrates the understanding of color in relation to materials, textures, light, and form.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students create FFE specification sheets and materials on final boards.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate within Process Reviews to demonstrate use of terminology and how color relates to their materials.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12j: Student work demonstrates the ability to appropriately select and apply color to support design purposes.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		72%; 5 students did not complete the assignment (missing diagrams, etc.); have more thorough reviews

						of project binders and make sure students understand requirements.
12j: Student work demonstrates the ability to appropriately select and apply color to support design purposes.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentation	Final boards and presentations shows understanding of color in design, board layout, and final presentation.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate a specific measure of this and/or add a diagram for presentations showcasing this.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12k: Student work demonstrates the ability to appropriately use color solutions across different modes of design communication.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		78%; Four students did not complete all aspects of the project/assignments; assess process reviews and project binder reviews more thoroughly; go through presentation prep more thoroughly
12k: Student work demonstrates the ability to appropriately use color solutions across different modes of design communication.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentation	Final boards and presentations shows understanding of color in design, board layout, and final presentation.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate a specific measure of this and/or add a diagram for presentations showcasing this.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
12l: Student work demonstrates the ability to appropriately use color solutions across different modes of design communication.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard	70% of 70%		78%; Four students did not complete all aspects of the project/assignments; assess process reviews and project binder reviews more thoroughly; go through presentation prep more thoroughly
12l: Student work demonstrates the ability to appropriately use color solutions across different modes of design communication.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Final Boards/ Presentation	Final boards and presentations shows understanding of color in design, board layout, and final presentation.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Incorporate a specific measure of this and/or add a diagram for presentations showcasing this.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

13a: Student work demonstrates understanding of how furnishings, objects, materials, and finishes work together to support the design intent.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards & Research Doc	Rubrics. Presentation Boards - materials/fixture/furniture selection. Research Document - Publisher specifications.	70% of 70%	65% & 53% - goal not met; Many students neglected to include labels on FFE or information on boards. No connection or design intent indicated on publisher files. Many students did not even select FFE. Make this an individual assignment during schematics. Provide specifics for publisher areas related to standards.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
13a: Student work demonstrates understanding of how furnishings, objects, materials, and finishes work together to support the design intent.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	FFE Specs	Students must submit furniture, finishes, and equipment specifications for their project, providing product information, justification, and information to support their selections.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept development with a focus early on of FF&E.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
13c: Student work demonstrates understanding of the life cycle cost of products and materials.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards & Research Doc	Rubrics. Presentation Boards - materials/fixture/furniture selection. Research Document - Publisher specifications.	70% of 70%	65% & 53% - goal not met; Many students neglected to include labels on FFE or information on boards. No connection or design intent indicated on publisher files. Many students did not even select FFE. Make this an individual assignment during schematics. Provide specifics for publisher areas related to standards.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
13c: Student work demonstrates understanding of the life cycle cost of products and materials.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	FFE Specs	Students must submit furniture, finishes, and equipment specifications for their project, providing product information, justification, and information to support their selections.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept development with a focus early on of FF&E.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

13d: Student work demonstrates understanding of appropriate design or specification of furnishings, equipment, materials, and finishes in relation to project criteria and human and environmental wellbeing.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards & Research Doc	Rubrics. Presentation Boards - materials/fixture/furniture selection. Research Document - Publisher specifications.	70% of 70%	65% & 53% - goal not met; Many students neglected to include labels on FFE or information on boards. No connection or design intent indicated on publisher files. Many students did not even select FFE. Make this an individual assignment during schematics. Provide specifics for publisher areas related to standards.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
13d: Student work demonstrates understanding of appropriate design or specification of furnishings, equipment, materials, and finishes in relation to project criteria and human and environmental wellbeing.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	FFE Specs	Students must submit furniture, finishes, and equipment specifications for their project, providing product information, justification, and information to support their selections.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept development with a focus early on of FF&E.	71%; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept development with a focus early on of FF&E.
13e: Students select and apply products and materials on the basis of their properties and performance criteria, including ergonomics, environmental attributes, and life safety.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Presentation Boards & Research Doc	Rubrics. Presentation Boards - materials/fixture/furniture selection. Research Document - Publisher specifications.	70% of 70%	65% & 53% - goal not met; Many students neglected to include labels on FFE or information on boards. No connection or design intent indicated on publisher files. Many students did not even select FFE. Make this an individual assignment during schematics. Provide specifics for publisher areas related to standards.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
13e: Students select and apply products and materials on the basis of their properties and performance criteria, including ergonomics,	IAD 452 (SP2024)	FFE Specs	Students must submit furniture, finishes, and equipment specifications for their project, providing product information, justification, and	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept	71%; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept

environmental attributes, and life safety.			information to support their selections.		development with a focus early on of FF&E.	development with a focus early on of FF&E.
14a: Students understand that design decisions relating to acoustics, thermal comfort, and indoor air quality impact human wellbeing and the environment.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Research	Rubric. Research Document - articles and application on IAQ, acoustics, wellness, lighting.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Students do research and explain how the principles can be applied through application, ensure students are actually applying knowledge to project and not just saying it. Add check for final.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14a: Students understand that design decisions relating to acoustics, thermal comfort, and indoor air quality impact human wellbeing and the environment.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14b: Students understand the principles of acoustical design.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Acoustic	Rubric. Research Document - Acoustic diagram and description.	70% of 70%	59% - goal not met; Make in class exercise. Have students refer to research and implement design moves graphically on diagram. Many students neglected to include design moves.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14b: Students understand the principles of acoustical design.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14c: Students understand appropriate strategies for acoustical control.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Acoustic	Rubric. Research Document - Acoustic diagram and description.	70% of 70%	59% - goal not met; Make in class exercise. Have students refer to research and implement design moves graphically on diagram. Many students neglected to include design moves.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14c: Students understand appropriate strategies for acoustical control.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

14d: Students understand the principles of thermal design	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Thermal	Rubric. Research Document - Thermal/HVAC diagram and description.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Make in class exercise. Have students refer to research and implement design moves graphically on diagram. Have students focus on active and passive systems.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14d: Students understand the principles of thermal design	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14e: Students understand how active and passive thermal systems and components impact interior design solutions.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Thermal	Rubric. Research Document - Thermal/HVAC diagram and description.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Make in class exercise. Have students refer to research and implement design moves graphically on diagram. Have students focus on active and passive systems.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14e: Students understand how active and passive thermal systems and components impact interior design solutions.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14f: Students understand the principles of water systems and waste systems.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Thermal	Rubric. Research Document - Thermal/HVAC diagram and description.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Make in class exercise. Have students refer to research and implement design moves graphically on diagram. Have students focus on active and passive systems.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14f: Students understand the principles of water systems and waste systems.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14g: Students understand strategies for integrating water systems and waste systems.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Thermal	Rubric. Research Document - Thermal/HVAC diagram and description.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Make in class exercise. Have students refer to research and implement design moves graphically on diagram. Have students	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

					focus on active and passive systems.	
14g: Students understand strategies for integrating water systems and waste systems	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14h: Students understand the principles of indoor air quality.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Research	Rubric. Research Document - articles and application on IAQ, acoustics, wellness, lighting.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Make this an in-class exercise where students actually document what they have selected in terms of products and design moves to reflect knowledge & understanding of IAQ.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14h: Students understand the principles of indoor air quality.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	FFE Specs	Students must submit furniture, finishes, and equipment specifications for their project, providing product information, justification, and information to support their selections	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept development with a focus early on of FF&E.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14i: Students understand how the selection and application of products and systems impact indoor air quality.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Research	Rubric. Research Document - articles and application on IAQ, acoustics, wellness, lighting.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Make this an in-class exercise where students actually document what they have selected in terms of products and design moves to reflect knowledge & understanding of IAQ.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
14i: Students understand how the selection and application of products and systems impact indoor air quality.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	FFE Specs	Students must submit furniture, finishes, and equipment specifications for their project, providing product information, justification, and information to support their selections.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Several students skipped the justification of selection for their projects. Incorporate more concept development with a focus early on of FF&E.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

15a: Students have awareness of the environmental impact of construction.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15a: Students have awareness of the environmental impact of construction.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment of exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15b: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by base-building structural systems and construction methods.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students submit a final set of construction documents for their final design including, demo, furniture, finish, details, millwork, interior elevations, and FFE specs.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Incorporate a section cut showing various structural elements.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15c: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by interior systems, construction, and installation methods.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students submit a final set of construction documents for their final design including, demo, furniture, finish, details, millwork, interior elevations, and FFE specs.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Incorporate a section cut showing various structural elements.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15d: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by detailing and specification of interior construction materials, products, and finishes.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students submit a final set of construction documents for their final design including, demo, furniture, finish, details, millwork, interior elevations, and FFE specs.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; More information about millwork, door details and schedules, FFE, connection to concept. Incorporate weekly dates of items to be completed.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15e: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by the integration of building systems including electrical (such as power, data, lighting, telecommunications, audio visual) and mechanical	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Power & Communication	Rubric. Research document - power and communication plans for focus areas.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Make an in-class exercise several students did not complete or did it incorrectly. Include a description so they discuss the impact of these systems and how designed for them.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

(such as HVAC, plumbing, and sprinklers).						
15e: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by the integration of building systems including electrical (such as power, data, lighting, telecommunications, audio visual) and mechanical (such as HVAC, plumbing, and sprinklers).	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students create a power and communication plan, lighting, plan, and life safety plan that incorporates various electrical, mechanical, and building control items.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Have students select area to detail these earlier on in the semester to focus more on details. A lot of plans did not have a lot of information.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15f: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by monitoring systems pertaining to energy, security, and building controls systems.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Building Control	Rubric. Research document - energy, security, and building controls diagrams.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Make an in-class exercise several students did not complete or did it incorrectly. Include a detailed description so they discuss the decisions and design moves.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15f: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by monitoring systems pertaining to energy, security, and building controls systems.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students create a power and communication plan, lighting, plan, and life safety plan that incorporates various electrical, mechanical, and building control items.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Have students select area to detail these earlier on in the semester to focus more on details. A lot of plans did not have a lot of information.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15g: Student work demonstrates understanding that design solutions affect and are impacted by vertical and horizontal systems of transport and circulation such as stairs, elevators, or escalators.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Circulation	Rubric. Research document - circulation diagrams and description.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue this as a part of earlier process review, include the description explaining understanding and design moves. Make a ramp of the requirement.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

15h: Students understand the formats, components, and accepted standards for an integrated and comprehensive set of interior construction documents.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs/ Thesis Document	Within the building codes section of the thesis, students must provide egress information, vertical, and horizontal circulation diagrams.	70% of 70%	71% - goal met; Some students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present code analysis early on as a separate assignment, it is incorporated with other items in an assignment and several students do not do it until the end.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15i: Students are able to read and interpret construction documents.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document	Pre-design investigation includes analysis of each student's existing building, history, structural analysis, distribution, integrated design practices, context, and demolition.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Have students select a minimum of three things from the existing building that will influence their design, research, synthesize, and apply it to their design.	88%; Have students select a minimum of three things from the existing building that will influence their design, research, synthesize, and apply it to their design.
15j: Students are able to contribute to the production of interior contract documents including drawings, detailing, schedules, and specifications appropriate to project size and scope.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Not directly assessed in this course	Need to create assignment or exercise for this standard.	70% of 70%		Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
15j: Students are able to contribute to the production of interior contract documents including drawings, detailing, schedules, and specifications appropriate to project size and scope.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Docs	Students submit a final set of construction documents for their final design including, demo, furniture, finish, details, millwork, interior elevations, and FFE specs.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; More information about millwork, door details and schedules, FFE, connection to concept. Incorporate weekly dates of items to be completed.	76%; More information about millwork, door details and schedules, FFE, connection to concept. Incorporate weekly dates of items to be completed.
16a: Students have awareness of the origins and intent of laws, codes, and standards.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Codes	Rubric. Research document - codes, fire & life safety.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue having this be an in-class exercise. It ensured everyone was on same page. Consider making earlier in semester and	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

					look at combining some of diagrams with it.	
16a: Students have awareness of the origins and intent of laws, codes, and standards.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document	Students must submit building codes, a summary of codes, occupancy, plumbing, egress, fire protection, and show application of laws and standards to their project.	70% of 70%	81% - goal met; Some students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present code analysis early on as a separate assignment, it is incorporated with other items in an assignment and several students do not do it until the end.	88%; Two students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present code analysis early on as a separate assignment, it is incorporated with other items in an assignment and several students do not do it until the end which at that point is too late.
16b: Student work demonstrates understanding of standards and guidelines related to sustainability and wellness.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Research	Rubric. Research Document - articles and application on IAQ, acoustics, wellness, lighting.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Make sustainability a new required section in document, so students can specifically express how they have designed for it.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
16b: Student work demonstrates understanding of standards and guidelines related to sustainability and wellness.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document	Students submit a description and graphic within final research document describing and noting sustainability and WELL Building Standards.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Some students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present analysis prior to presentations.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
16c: Student work demonstrates understanding of sector-specific regulation and guidelines related to construction, products, and materials.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Codes	Rubric. Research document - codes, fire & life safety.	70% of 70%	82% - goal met; Continue having this be an in-class exercise. It ensured everyone was on same page. Consider making earlier in semester and look at combining some of diagrams with it.	Codes - 88% Boards - 71%; Two students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present code analysis early on as a separate assignment, it is incorporated with other items in an assignment and several students do not do it

						until the end which at that point is too late.
16c: Student work demonstrates understanding of sector-specific regulation and guidelines related to construction, products, and materials.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document, Final Boards	Students must submit building codes, a summary of codes, occupancy, plumbing, egress, fire protection, and show application of laws and standards to their project. Final boards include final design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on communication of the design story.	70% of 70%	Codes - 71% Boards - 82%- goals met; Some students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present code analysis early on as a separate assignment, it is incorporated with other items in an assignment and several students do not do it until the end.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
16d: Student work demonstrates understanding of detection such as active devices that alert occupants including smoke/heat and alarm systems.	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Fire Protection	Rubric. Research document - fire protection diagrams and description.	70% of 70%	94% - goal met; Continue having this as an in-class exercise, review requirements for smoke and sprinklers.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.
16d: Student work demonstrates understanding of detection such as active devices that alert occupants including smoke/heat and alarm systems.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Thesis Document, Final Boards	Students must submit building codes, a summary of codes, occupancy, plumbing, egress, fire protection, and show application of laws and standards to their project. Final boards include final design ideas, drawings, perspectives, and layout focusing on communication of the design story.	70% of 70%	Codes - 71% Boards - 82% - goals met; Some students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present code analysis early on as a separate assignment, it is incorporated with other items in an assignment and several students do not do it until the end.	Codes - 88% Boards - 71%; Two students did not complete this section in their research document. Have students present code analysis early on as a separate assignment, it is incorporated with other items in an assignment and several students do not do it until the end which at that point is too late.
16e: Student work demonstrates understanding of compartmentalization such	IAD 451 (FA2023)	Research Doc - Fire Protection	Rubric. Research document - fire protection diagrams and description.	70% of 70%	94% - goal met; Continue having this as an in-class exercise, review requirements for smoke and sprinklers.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

as fire separation and smoke containment.						
16e: Student work demonstrates understanding of compartmentalization such as fire separation and smoke containment.	IAD 452 (SP2024)	Construction Documents	Students must create Enlarged Restroom plans and interior elevations noting accessibility standards that were adhered to.	70% of 70%	76% - goal met; Incorporate barrier-free and accessibility items earlier on in the semester to ensure students plan meet the minimum requirements. Some student plans did not meet these codes.	Prior results are not available for this course/standard.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	Faculty reviewed the curriculum matrix in May 2024, reviewing courses in relation to CIDA accreditation recommendations for improvement. The standards needing to be addressed in this assessment (those standards lacking an assignment, etc.) is very evident, especially Standard 12 – Lighting and Color and Standard 14 – Environmental Systems and Human Wellbeing, and are aligned with the standards the CIDA review team recommended to improve. This stated, while we need to improve course assignments, it also shows that the program and courses are well aligned for the CIDA accrediting body. One course, IAD 470 – Portfolio, has had adjunct instructors in recent years. Due to this, it has been difficult to obtain the needed information for assessment. To improve this, the class and the adjunct instructor need to be monitored more closely or have enough permanent faculty to cover the course. Many classes being assessed are meeting the 70% threshold; however, there are some classes that need to be monitored to move past the median range of 75%. Overall, the courses assessed meet thresholds.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	Since 2020, after having a slight drop in enrollment, the IAD program has seen incremental improvement. This also reflects in graduation rates; more students are graduating and being employed within the interior design field.
What student success indicators are concerning?	Four-year graduation rates are concerning.

Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	A small percentage of students often need to retake courses to improve their GPA requirements for the program. IAD faculty have created ways to better assist these students with passing required courses and improving GPA. Often this is having one-on-one meetings to develop time management skills as well as assistance specifically with coursework.

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	It appears that many of the standards assessed in 2021-2022 have influenced the outcomes for this assessment year. Exercises and/or assignments have become better aligned with the standards that are assessed.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	The priorities are to focus on standards 12 and 14 in relation to CIDA accreditation, creating coursework that can be implemented and assessed. In addition, the program will continue meeting after the spring semester to review courses and adjust improve courses, but also to prepare for the next accreditation. One main priority is to have stable faculty; it has been shown that when we have consistent (the same person) teaching courses, student retention rates are better, especially for the first-year classes.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	Seeking continued support for faculty as well as attaining an additional full-time faculty will help with retention rates as well as current faculty teaching loads.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Standard 12 and Standard 14 will be the focus; adding assignments and exercises for those standards in upper studios (IAD 451 and IAD 452).
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	The faculty for the individual courses complete assessment and submit results to the IAD program coordinator. The data is shared with the professional industry advisory board at their spring meeting to get feedback from the board and to ensure the program is moving in the right direction in relation to the interior design industry.

Academic Program:		**Date:**	
Author(s):			
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

- Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.)
- Established Performance Goal
- Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Goal (provide specific data rather than general observations)
- Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?

2. Student Success Activities

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?

What student success indicators are concerning?

Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.

Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?

What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how findings will be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Interior Architecture Design BFA
Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	I know you record data annually for CIDA accreditation. You make break down which LOs you report on over the course of a 3-4 year cycle for the SOASRs, if you prefer.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***- in many cases these weren't defined; see notes***	It was noted in multiple cases that some of the aligned courses for LO assessment did include aligned assessment measures. If this is a regular issue, consider changing aligned courses or developing assignments. If this is an issue that occurred due to faculty and/or curriculum changes, consider identifying secondary sources of data as a backup or redundancy for future assessment cycles. Where defined, evaluation tools seem well-suited to provide accurate data on individual LOs. Often these weren't defined; instead a detailed description of the assignment was given. That is helpful information, but more information about how student assignment performance relative to the aligned LO is needed (e.g.,.	Mature (overall, but would be considered Developing given the missing information)

			analytical rubric, exam key that only reports scores from questions aligned with that LO, etc.)	
Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	70% reaching 70% or higher on all measures seems like aiming for an average expectation rather than a reasonably high expectation for student performance.	Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment		Mature

sharing what we have learned.		Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:		**Date:**	
Author(s):			
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
6.1. Demonstrate the ability to implement management information systems that meets requirement specification and fulfills through tests.	ECT 301	Three exams throughout the semester	Three exams throughout the semester	75% of students achieve an 80 or higher evaluation on the exams.	17 IT students took ECT 301. Their semester exams covered the course material. In these exams 47% of the students achieved 80% or higher. Overall, 41% of the students in this class passed it with a B or higher.	I don't have prior data.
6.2. Ability to produce solutions to solve a problem that meet stakeholders' requirements.	ECT 301	Final Project Development	Final Project Development Rubric	60% of students receive a 80% or more on developing a database	17 IT students took ECT 301. Their final creative project entailed creating a database. In that assignment 76.47% of them completed the final project assignment. 54% of them earned 80% or higher.	

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	**Student exams are going well, their final project completion rate needs improvement. Some students expressed personal/family factors that hindered their ability to finish the course work.**

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	Student exams are trending well.
What student success indicators are concerning?	Final project completion.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	Last year's data was for a different course.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Encourage students to finish the course's final project.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Emphasize the importance of finishing the final project. The project is an application of what students learn in the book, so its challenge is balanced and requires students' time to be spent on finishing it.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	

Academic Program:		**Date:**	
Author(s):			
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

- Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.)
- Established Performance Goal
- Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Goal (provide specific data rather than general observations)
- Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?

2. Student Success Activities

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?

What student success indicators are concerning?

Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.

Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?

What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how findings will be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Information Technology BS
Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)		Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) ***– in some cases, see notes*** Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) ***– in some cases, see notes*** Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***– in some cases, see notes***	For LO6.1, exams are used as the assessment measure, but it is unclear if students are answering questions or demonstrating "ability to implement MIS that meets…" as detailed in the LO. Additionally, if these exams cover any material that is not part of this LO, the scores for any questions pertaining to that additional material should not be included in the data reported for this LO. Component scores related to the LO in question are all that should be reported, and I can't tell from the information provided if that is the case here.	Developing

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	The discussion of results notes that exams are going well, but barely half of students are meeting the established goal. For the ECT 301 Final Project, it might be helpful to break out rubric component scores to pinpoint areas of strength and weakness. This kind of feedback can help faculty better target improvements to curriculum, teaching, and/or assignments to improve student learning.	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	Final project completion has been identified as a major area for concern. Consider plans to consult with faculty who also have major final projects for ideas on how to help students break the project down into manageable parts that can be completed in a timely manner. There are many such examples from BCET programs. The Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence may also be able to provide solutions. Consider addressing the exam scores as well. Even if students on the whole are passing, nearly half are not meeting the goal that has been set for proficiency.	Undeveloped

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Academic Program:	Mechanical Engineering Technology	**Date:**	Nov. 18, 2024
Author(s):	Mehran Shahhosseini, mehran.shahhosseini@indstate.edu		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu.		_X_ Learning Outcomes _X_ Curriculum Map _X_ Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		___ Yes ___ No _X_ Hybrid	

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Benchmark for Proficiency**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark**	**Prior Results for Comparison** (if applicable)
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
3. An ability to apply written, oral, and graphical communication in broadly defined technical and non-technical environments; and an ability to identify and use appropriate technical literature	MET409	Capstone Senior Project	Rubric	Rubric scores average above 75% of students avg 4.0 (LKT 1-5 scale)	SP24 Average of 3.50 out of 4.00 OR 4.38 (LKT 1-5 scale). (Rubric and scores of seven projects, 3 face-to-face and 4 online, are in Appendix)	
5. An ability to function effectively as a member as well as a leader on technical teams	MET409	Capstone Senior Project	Rubric	Rubric: 90% of students avg 4.0 (LKT 1-5 scale)	SP24 Average of 3.55 out of 4.00 OR 4.43 (LKT 1-5 scale). (Rubric and scores of seven projects, 3 face-to-face and 4 online, are in Appendix)	

Student Success Activities

Use Blue Reports to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):

Enrollment and Retention

Bailey College of Engr & Tech
Appl Engineer & Tech Mgt
Mechanical Engineering Technol (E632)

Data on Major

	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
University UG Enrollment	8,939	7,704	6,965	6,669	6,224
Major	262	221	171	141	142
Percentage UG Enrollment	2.93%	2.87%	2.46%	2.11%	2.28%
Disaggregated					
Campus	122	97	83	73	83
Distance	140	124	88	68	59
Continuing	198	180	135	108	104
New Freshman	22	11	19	17	21
New Transfer	40	28	15	14	14
Readmit/Returning	2	2	2	2	3

American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	0
Asian	3	5	5	2	5
Black or African American	17	11	12	11	21
Hispanics of any race	18	19	17	14	11
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0
Nonresident Alien	19	12	1	0	1
Two or more races	3	4	3	6	8
White	198	169	131	106	94
Race and Ethnicity Unknown	4	1	2	2	2

Female	24	35	26	21	18
Male	238	186	145	120	124

	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
Mechanical Engin Tech Conc (E6C2)		1			
No Concentration	262	220	171	141	142

Degrees Awarded

Trends

	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
University UG Total Degrees	1,957	1,863	1,747	1,595	1,488
Major – All	67	65	56	65	31
Major – Campus	39	24	28	30	12
Major – Distance	28	41	28	35	19
Percentage of University UG Degrees	3.49%	3.53%	3.27%	4.13%	2.12%

4-Year Graduation Rates

First-Year Freshman

	Entered Fall 2015 28.29%		Entered Fall 2016 32.59%		Entered Fall 2017 30.15%		Entered Fall 2018 32.83%		Entered Fall 2019 33.72%		Entered Fall 2020 33.71%	
	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad%	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad%	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %
Major	34	41.18%	29	62.07%	30	20.00%	37	32.43%	34	50.00%	22	54.55%
Campus	34	41.18%	29	62.07%	30	20.00%	37	32.43%	34	50.00%	22	54.55%
Distance	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

First Time Transfer

	Entered Fall 2015 55.63%		Entered Fall 2016 56.87%		Entered Fall 2017 57.64%		Entered Fall 2018 52.65%		Entered Fall 2019 55.22%		Entered Fall 2020 56.57%	
	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad%	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad%	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %	Cohort Total	Cohort Grad %
Major	16	43.75%	25	76.0%	18	20.00%	15	66.67%	19	57.89%	15	73.33%
Campus	11	54.55%	20	80.00%	9	77.78%	10	70.00%	8	62.50%	5	80.00%
Distance	3	20.00%	5	60.00%	9	77.78%	5	60.00%	11	54.55%	10	70.00%

Progress to Degree

Average Total Credits to Degree

	AY 2020-21	AY 2021-22	AY 2022-23	AY 2023-24
University Baccalaureate Programs	135.8	136.2	136.3	136.1
Major – All	139.2	135.8	138.5	136.6
Major – Campus	146.0	137.6	136.3	131.00
Major - Distance	135.1	134.0	140.4	140.1

Average Years to Graduation

	AY 2020-21	AY 2021-22	AY 2022-23	AY 2023-24
University Baccalaureate Programs	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1
Major – All	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.3
Major – Campus	4.0	3.6	4.1	3.6
Major – Distance	3.1	2.8	3.0	3.1

New Freshmen Admits

Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
88	142	148	155

1st Year Retention

All

	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
University	61.97%	65.24%	68.72%	60.55%	64.27%	68.55%	65.85%	0.00%
Latest Major	70.00%	67.57%	70.59%	81.82%	75.00%	92.00%	80.00%	0.00%
Original Major	68.75%	63.16%	61.11%	81.82%	63.64%	84.21%	76.47%	0.00%

Campus

	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
Latest Major	70.00%	67.57%	70.59%	81.82%	75.00%	92.00%	80.00%	--
Original Major	68.75%	63.16%	61.11%	81.82%	63.64%	84.21%	76.47%	--

Distance

	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022	Fall 2023	Fall 2024
Latest Major	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Original Major	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Enrollment in the MET program is a little higher than last year. Our recruitment and retention efforts have resulted in a year to year stabilization. Strong activity within our hybrid online program offers avenues of future advancement, along with upcoming transfer agreements with several junior colleges and community colleges.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

By including "industry based" project learning, experiential activity, and professional/student organizations such as the ISU American Society of Mechanical Engineers student chapter, this allows the students access to the critical items that translate between academics and their profession.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

Determining a method to increase the preparedness of the students when taking the assessment testing.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*	Career readiness is significantly demonstrated within the capstone Senior Design project course of MET409.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Inclusion of MET299 CAD Fundamentals and MET Power Systems, as a required course, has been effective in the performance of the students within the capstone Senior Design project course of MET409.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	We will be focused on curriculum changes that more align with ABET and the elements of our assessment testing.
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	This information will be shared with advisory board members and MET faculty across multiple disciplines.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Mechanical Engineering Technology BS

Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LOs, especially LO3, are very compound, meaning accurately measuring each of the displays of learning/skill described in the LO is challenging. Ensure that measurement tools are sufficiently reflective of all aspects of the LO, or consider making LOs more measureable.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***–somewhat; see notes***	Thank you for including the rubrics – be careful to redact student names if providing scored work in the future so their scores aren't visible when these reports are shared on our public-facing webpage. The rubrics do not include any reference to whether students identify and use appropriate technical literature (LO3). The language in the rubric is also subjective to instructor scoring. This isn't a problem for grading purposes, but it does limit the power of the scores to inform students of what they specifically need to improve and other faculty of how the curriculum and/or teaching can be adapted to better support specific areas that need improvement without additional notations.	Developing

			Note for ABET: Since these are group projects, it may be necessary to include other points of data from assessments that directly indicate individual student master of LOs, per accreditation requirements.	
Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	<<It is strange that the benchmark for proficiency is quite a bit lower for LO3 than for LO5 (75% of students meeting or exceeding for one, compared with 90% for the other). These targets aren't for what you believe students can do based on knowledge of their aptitude, but what you believe students need to be able to do in order to be proficient. Actual performance data is only reported as the average score, while benchmarks indicate a certain percentage of students meeting or exceeding the benchmark.	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed	Little information is provided about how multiple program faculty are involved in assessment, on action plans for maintaining strong performance, and what will be assessed in the coming year.	Developing

results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Manufacturing Engineering Technology	**Date:**	11/21/2024
Author(s):	Randy Peters		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	_X__ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
1. an ability to apply knowledge, techniques, skills and modern tools of mathematics, science, engineering, and technology to solve broadly-defined engineering problems appropriate to the discipline	ET 499 Senior Project	Major Project Exit Survey	Rubric Survey	Rubric scores average >75% Exit Survey average >3.0 (5.0 scale)	No data recorded as there were no MFET students in the ET 499 courses in the previous year.	Previous data from two years ago is not relevant as the assessment plan has changed from using the ATMAE CTM exams to senior project rubrics
4. an ability to conduct standard tests, measurements, and experiments and to analyze and interpret the results to improve processes	ET 499 Senior Project	Major Project Exit Survey	Rubric Survey	Rubric scores average >75% Exit Survey average >3.0 (5.0 scale)	No data recorded as there were no MFET students in the ET 499 courses in the previous year.	Previous data from two years ago is not relevant as the assessment plan has changed from using the ATMAE CTM exams to senior project rubrics
5. an ability to function effectively as a member as well as a leader on technical teams	ET 499 Senior Project	Major Project Exit Survey	Rubric Survey	Rubric scores average >75% Exit Survey average >3.0 (5.0 scale)	No data recorded as there were no MFET students in the ET 499 courses in the previous year.	Previous data from two years ago is not relevant as the assessment plan has changed from using the ATMAE CTM exams to senior project rubrics

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	Nothing can be gleaned as there were no students from which to collect data.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	None
What student success indicators are concerning?	The lack of students in the program is cause for immediate action. There were only 6 admits for fall 2024 yielding only one student. With just two students in the program, it makes no sense to continue. The program has been placed in Curriculog to be suspended effectively in
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Suspend the program.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	With the expected suspension of the program, we will focus on teaching out the last student in the program. There is no need for a teach-out plan as all

	courses in the MFET program are being taught as they are required for other programs in the college which are not low enrolled.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Manufacturing Engineering Technology BS

Evaluation: Cannot Evaluate

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LOs are complex, which can make them hard to accurately measure. Ensure that measurement tools allow for precise measurement of all skills/knowledge listed in each LO.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)		Mature

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described		Cannot Evaluate
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	ABET Note – Be sure to see if there are any accreditor requirements for reporting program closure and support to the remaining student.	Cannot Evaluate

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Master of Science Occupational Safety Management	**Date:**	October 31, 2024
Author(s):	Charmaine Mullins Jaime		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus __x_ Distance ___ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
SLO 1.1 Conduct hazard assessments, audits and inspections	610	Homework 4 conducting assessments	rubric	70% of the students received 70/100 or better.	100% of the students received 70/100 or better.	None-new outcome assessment as of 2023.
SLO 1.2 Describe and apply common hazard and risk analysis methods and can use various hazard analysis tools	511, 606, 631	SFTY 511: Midterm Exam SFTY 606: Assignment 2 Use of ergonomics assessment tools SFTY 631: Exposure calculation assignment 1	SFTY 511: key SFTY 606: rubric SFTY 631: key	70% of the students received 70/100 or better	SFTY 511: 100% of the students received 70/100 or better. SFTY 606: 87% of the students received 70/100 or better SFTY 631: 82% of the students received 70/100 or better	None-new outcome assessment as of 2023.
SLO 1.3 Describe common workplace hazards	610	Homework 4	rubric	70% of the students received 70/100 or better	100% of the students received 70/100 or better.	None-new outcome assessment as of 2023.

SLO 2.1 Assess hazards and risk as it pertains to occupational health safety and environmental management and makes appropriate recommendations to minimize risk	516, 606	SFTY 516: Assignment 3- conduct hazard assessments and write hazard and risk analysis and treatment policy SFTY 606: Assignment 1 NIOSH Lift Equation	SFTY 516: rubric SFTY 606: rubric	70% of the students received 70/100 or better	SFTY 516: 90% of the students received 70/100 or better. SFTY 606: 100% of the students received 70/100 or better.	None-new outcome assessment as of 2023.
SLO 2.2 Describe risk treatment methods including the use of the hierarchy of controls	610	Assessment using Hierarchy of Controls and 511 does not), Quiz 1	key	70% of the students received 70/100 or better	100% of the students received 70/100 or better	None-new outcome assessment as of 2023.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	These SLOs assess programs outcomes 1 and 2: 1. Hazard awareness and use of hazard and risk analysis methods and tools (IH, ergonomics/human factors, audits, inspections, EH&S compliance) and 2. Makes appropriate risk treatment recommendations based on best practices, proper use of assessment tools, and applied math, science, industrial hygiene and engineering methods including human factors engineering. The students generally did well and were able to draw on the multidisciplinary fields to assess hazards, estimate and, as appropriate, calculate risk (exposures) and make the appropriate recommendations and can draft policy on hazard control and risk treatment.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	Enrollment is up slightly which may be a good indicator our efforts to attract students are working
What student success indicators are concerning?	It seems to be trending positive, but enrolment is always something to watch. I see the credits to completion and timeline can be improved and there have been changes in the last few years may should help that trend.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in*	

navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).	

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	Last year, we prioritized hiring a new tenure track faculty to help us replace the faculty we lost to retirement and administration. We successfully hired a faculty, and he will join us in Spring 2024 and will help us improve our curriculum, grow our program, and our graduate faculty resources as we will have another PhD faculty to help grad students with their research projects and with advising.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Continue to work with students and continue to improve the curriculum. We are planning some program and course changes that will not affect the student learning outcomes as they were developed last year with this plan in mind, but we have been moving toward environmental health and safety versus just safety management in the curriculum as this is the range of disciplines and specialties that a modern safety professional now works in. Our professional organizations have been moving in that direction and it has been recommended by our advisory board so with the addition of a new tt faculty we'll have the resources needed to be able to update our programs and curriculum to meet new industry demands.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	NA
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	SLO 3.1 Develop hazard specific and general training programs SLO 3.2 Develop general safety, health, and environmental management policies, procedures and hazard specific injury prevention programs SLO 3.3 Demonstrate proficiency in presentations SLO 4.1 Can contextualize health, safety and environmental management issues in terms of regulatory compliance and ethics SLO 4.2 Can contextualize health, safety and environmental management problems in terms of various theories including safety climate, motivation and human factors, human performance and apply interventions SLO 4.3 Can recognize and discuss current and possible future applications of environmental health and safety within socio-technical systems

Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	Faculty have reviewed SLOs and will be participating in the updating of all program outcomes and corresponding SLOs. Faculty will meet in Program Meetings, Department Meetings, and Advisory Council meetings to share with other stakeholders in the program, department, and others.

Academic Program:	Master of Science Occupational Safety Management	**Date:**	October 31, 2024
Author(s):	Charmaine Mullins Jaime		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus __x_ Distance ___ Both		

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

- Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.)
- Established Performance Goal
- Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Goal (provide specific data rather than general observations)
- Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?

2. Student Success Activities

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?

What student success indicators are concerning?

Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.

Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?

What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how findings will be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Occupational Safety Management MS

Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)		Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum ***– in some cases*** Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***– in some cases, see notes***	For LOs where the same assessments are used, it is hard to tell if the evaluation tool (rubric, exam key, etc) is isolating separate component scores for individual LOs, or if only the composite score for the assessment is reported. Ensuring component scores are reported enhances the accuracy of understanding specific LO mastery.	Mature

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	70% of students meeting or exceeding 70% seems low for a graduate program since that is just passing.	Developing
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Mature

Academic Program Assessment Plan
Indiana State University Office of Assessment & Accreditation

Using this template:

- This plan is meant to be a multi-year guide to assessing student learning outcomes of your curriculum.
- This plan should be completed collaboratively with the faculty in your program.
- This plan, along with the program curriculum map and assessment timeline, should be reviewed at the beginning of each academic year to ensure that the courses, measures, and performance goals are still relevant and to notify the responsible faculty of the expectation and means to collect and communicate the needed performance data from the listed measures.
- If you would like assistance developing your assessment plan or discussing best practices for determining courses and designing measures for assessment, the Director of Assessment & Program Effectiveness is at your service. Call x7975 or email Kelley.Woods-Johnson@indstate.edu.

Program: Professional Aviation Flight Technology (PAFT)	**Department: Aviation Technology (AVT)**
Primary Author: Frank Manderino -Senior Instructor, PAFT Program Coordinator	**Date: 11-21-24**

PART ONE

For each program student learning outcome determine the following to assess student achievement of the learning outcome:

- *Which **course(s)** aligned with this outcome (check your curriculum map) will be used for assessing this outcome?*
- *Which **semester(s)** is this course being taught during the year for assessment?*
- *Which **measure(s)** (parts of/full assignments, tests, projects, licensure exams) will we use to evaluate student performance of learning outcomes?*
- *What **level of performance** do we expect from students to indicate they achieved the learning outcome?*
- *Which **faculty will be responsible** for sharing student performance on these measures with the program or department chair or assessment coordinator?*

It is not necessary to assess all outcomes every year. It is best practice to assess all outcomes at least once per student cohort, so every 3-4 years.

An example is given in the first line that should be deleted when you complete the form. Continue to add cells as needed until you have created a plan for all student learning outcomes in your program.

Learning Outcome	**Course(s) for Assessment**	**Semester(s) Taught**	**Measure(s)**	**Performance Goal(s)** *(update as needed)*	**Faculty Responsible** *(update as needed)*

Professional Aviation Flight Technology Learning Outcomes Outcome 1: Mastery of knowledge, techniques, skills, and tools. 1.1 Knowledge of aircraft systems. 1.2 Knowledge of Commercial Flight Maneuvers. 1.3 Knowledge of Federal Aviation Regulations.	AVT 344 Commercial Pilot Flight	Fall, Spring, and Summer	<u>The FAA Practical Exam involves an oral exam with an FAA Designated Examiner and a flight exam portion in the actual airplane.</u> **Corrective Actions from the 2023-24 Assessment that were implemented successfully:** **Issue #1:** The shortage of qualified flight instructors continues to be a challenge as the pilot shortage continues. It is the "new normal" in my opinion. Inexperienced "Check Instructors" could be a factor in the low pass rate. **Corrective Action (Implemented):** We have now instituted Senior Instructors doing the last check prior to the Practical Exam. **Issue #2:** There is also a shortage of FAA Inspectors and Designated Examiners to perform the practical tests. It is believed that some of the students were ready and well prepared to take the practical exam but could not get an exam scheduled until 2 months or later after the final stage check (assessment for the practical test by ISU Flight Academy. **Corrective Action (Implemented):** If more than 30 days has elapsed since the final stage check and recommendation for the FAA Practical Test, the student must repeat the final stage check (Oral and flight portion) satisfactorily again prior to doing the Practical Exam. **Issue#3:** I think that the lack of Asst. Chief Instructors and/or de-brief and review	The Aircrew Certification Standards (ACS, attached as a pdf below) lists the specific criteria and is the rubric for the oral and flight portion of the FAA Practical Exam. Students typically train for at least one year for this exam.  commercial_airplane_acs_change_1.pdf I am setting a goal of 85% pass rate for the first attempt on the FAA Commercial Pilot Practical Test (aka Check Ride) for ISU Aviation (PAFT). FAA minimum standards for an FAA Part 141 certified school such as the ISU Flight Academy is an 80% pass rate on the first attempt. The 2023-24 AY results were as follows: Of the 24 FAA Practical Exams given for AVT 344 there were 5 failures on the first attempt. 0 Failures on the second attempt. This equates to a 80% first time pass rate.	Frank Manderino

			immediately following the Practical Exams may be a point of failure. We should try to learn what areas our instruction is weak in from our student's failures, but the information on why student's have failed seems vague or non-existent. **Corrective Action (Implemented):** To have a de-brief database created to store examiner and student feedback on what weak areas were detected if any on the FAA Practical Exams. **Issue#4:** One of the FAA Examiners that had been used for practical exams throughout this academic year proved to have a fail rate for students that was almost double that of the other 4-5 examiners that typically examined our students. **Corrective Action (Implemented):** We are not using the above-mentioned examiner going forward. **Issue #5:** First Time Pass Rate for all FAA Practical Exams will be monitored more closely and checked more often. **Corrective Action (Implemented):** The PAFT Degree Program Coordinator (myself) will reach out to Flight Academy leadership. I want to set up a (de-identified) de-brief for all students that take the FAA Practical Exams. Improvements in teaching can be introduced based on the outcomes that are discovered.		

PART TWO	
Use the space below to indicate how findings will be ***analyzed***, ***shared***, and ***used to improve/support student learning***. Examples are given in italics. These can be deleted when you fill out the table with your own plans.	
Who will be responsible for analyzing findings each AY?	*Program Coordinator, Department chair, and Chief Instructor Pilot.*
How will findings be shared with program faculty and others (as appropriate)?	*I plan to share the results with regular Aviation Dept. Faculty and the Chief Instructor Pilot.* *The FAA will also request this data in annual inspections of our Flight Academy.*
How will faculty engage in using findings to improve student learning?	*Our Senior Flight Instructor and PAFT Faculty meet monthly. The pass rates are discussed at these regular meetings and after any FAA inspection.* *All Flight Instructors now log their students' reasons for failure and who the FAA Examiner was that conducted the practical test. This is done for Private Pilot, Instrument Pilot, and Commercial Pilot certifications (AVT 144, AVT 244, and AVT 344).* *Instructor and student names are de-identified in the log. The log of reasons for failure is available to all PAFT students and instructors.* *This allows us a way to monitor and promote continuous improvement.* *Senior Flight Instructors also hold monthly tutoring sessions on topic areas that have been identified as weaknesses and areas where a trend of failure has been identified.* *I will hopefully be able to create some charts or data to represent the most common failure areas before and after tutoring sessions.* *That will take another academic year to collect and analyze.* *But, we now are gathering the data in detailed fashion as to specific areas where failures have occurred.* *For example: A few students have failed due to not being able to properly interpret a weather report on current airport weather conditions. The conditions are encoded and must ne properly decoded.* *We could ask why, determine, where to initiate enhancement or a change to training and which class it should occur in.* *We could also make attendance at tutoring sessions worth points in the class.*

	I am excited that we are focusing on the improvement that we need. *Our pass rate currently sits at the minimum threshold for the FAA's 80% first time pass rate.* *We have improvement to do.*

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Professional Aviation Flight Technology BS

Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	"Knowledge" is pretty vague language in the LOs, making it hard to specify what type of knowledge and how students have to be able to demonstrate it in order to mastery the LO.	Developing
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.	Good use of industry practical test as a culminating assessment.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)	If you are unable to get more post-test data from the debriefing strategy you described, consider analyzing additional sources of course-based data or indirect assessments from student input to better diagnose and address deficiencies.	Mature

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.	Excellent discussion of insights gained from analysis of the data.	The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described		Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.	Excellent connections made between finding analysis and corrective actions. Action plans are clear and directly tied to strategies for improving student outcomes.	Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Exemplary

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Packaging Engineering Technology	**Date:**	11/15/2024
Author(s):	Brian James		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	_X_ Campus ___ Distance ___ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
3. An ability to apply written, oral, and graphical communication in broadly-defined technical and non-technical environments; and an ability to identify and use appropriate technical literature.	ET 499	Capstone Exam Capstone Project	Exam Rubric	Exam avg >60% (100%) Rubric avg >75% (100%)	Exam avg = 74% Rubric avg = 90%	Exam avg = 63% Rubric avg = 87%

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	The exam scores improved from 63% to 74%, indicating progress in student understanding, but data revealed inconsistencies, with some students excelling while others struggled. Passive student feedback suggested some students did not take the assessment seriously, potentially skewing insights. Notably, students who performed well on the exam also tended to do well in class, reinforcing the connection between active participation and success. Project rubric scores improved from 87% to 90%, a positive outcome. However, the lack of detailed feedback on written, oral, and graphical communication, as well as the use of technical literature, highlighted the need for a more granular rubric. The department did not send out the exit survey, leaving no data for the indirect measure. Overall, current assessment measures show positive trends, and planned improvements will provide deeper insights into student learning.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	The program's enrollment increased from 15 students in Fall 2023 to 17 in Fall 2024, a positive trend despite the university's overall undergraduate enrollment decline. Admission applications also indicate a steady influx of new students, with 2 to 3 new freshmen annually. First-year retention rates for the program have consistently outperformed university averages, with recent years showing retention rates as high as 88.89%. The program's average years to graduation remains competitive, improving to 3.7 years in 2023-24 compared to 4.7 years in prior years, and is below the university average of 4.1 years. Additionally, 4-year graduation rates for small cohorts have seen highs of 100% and remain above 50% in recent years, reflecting strong progress to degree completion. These indicators demonstrate resilience and effectiveness in supporting student success.
What student success indicators are concerning?	The program's enrollment has declined over the last five years, from 29 students in Fall 2020 to 17 in Fall 2024, reflecting a 41% decrease. This trend mirrors the overall university decline but raises concerns. These indicators suggest a need for targeted recruitment efforts and strategies.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	Additional student success data highlights the program's curriculum update to better align with industry needs and the approved Distance designation, broadening the recruitment scope to include distance learners and industry professionals while offering flexibility for campus students. Job placement rates are exceptional, with 100% of graduates actively searching employment are employed in their field within six months of graduation. Internship participation is also at 100%, ensuring students gain critical practical experience. Average starting salaries have risen to $65,000, reflecting strong employer demand for graduates. The program's faculty-to-student ratio of 1:17 supports personalized attention, enhancing student outcomes. Students also complete numerous industry-aligned projects and benefit from industry guest speakers in classes, reinforcing their professional readiness.

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	The action plan from the previous year focused on improving assessment tools, specifically updating rubrics to provide more granular insights into written, oral, and graphical communication and the use of technical literature. While the updated rubric has yet to be fully implemented, initial improvements in project scores (from 87% to 90%) suggest progress in student learning. However, the lack of an exit survey due to departmental issues limited indirect feedback. These activities demonstrate a positive influence on student outcomes, but further refinement and consistent implementation of updated tools are necessary to fully evaluate their impact.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	We are transitioning from using the Capstone Exam to embedding relevant questions into reports from projects completed in Packaging courses. This approach integrates assessment directly into coursework, providing more meaningful data and better alignment with the skills and knowledge developed throughout the program. Relevant exam questions will be included in these reports and evaluated using a detailed rubric to measure student learning more effectively. Last year's assessment plan evaluated each Learning Outcome (LO) on a two-year cycle but did not assess an LO annually. The revised plan ensures that at least one LO is assessed each year, with LO3, LO1 and LO4, and LO2 and LO5 evaluated respectively. Direct measures will now occur earlier in the academic career, focusing on PKG 381, PKG 484, and PKG 486, allowing Packaging-specific instructors to oversee the evaluations. For indirect measures, the Program Coordinator will manage and distribute self-assessment surveys to students in the ET 499 course, ensuring consistent survey administration and reliable data collection. These changes are designed to maintain strong performance while addressing gaps in previous processes, ultimately providing more detailed and actionable insights into student learning outcomes.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	We will focus on ensuring alignment of our ABET accreditation outcomes with the University's assessment processes. With a relatively new Program Coordinator, training and support will be essential to ensure a thorough understanding of assessment procedures and best practices. Collaboration with the University's Institutional Research and Assessment office will be explored to provide guidance and resources for this alignment. Additionally, professional development opportunities, such as workshops or consultations with experienced ABET coordinators, will be pursued to strengthen the program's assessment framework.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	Next year, the assessment plan will focus on **LO1** (applying technical knowledge and tools to solve problems) and **LO4** (conducting tests and improving processes). To improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data, direct measures will continue

	to be embedded earlier in the curriculum, specifically in PKG 484 and PKG 486. These measures will use updated rubrics to provide more granular insights into student performance. Indirect measures will rely on self-assessment surveys in ET 499, managed by the Program Coordinator to ensure consistent administration and data collection. Additionally, we plan to review and refine the survey questions to better capture students' perceptions of their skills and learning experiences. These changes aim to improve the reliability and depth of data collected for program evaluation.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	Faculty are actively involved in the assessment process by embedding and evaluating direct measures in their courses, using rubrics to assess student performance. They also participate in annual program meetings where assessment data and findings are reviewed collaboratively. Faculty contribute to refining assessment tools, such as rubrics and surveys, to ensure alignment with program and ABET goals. Findings are shared with faculty during these meetings and documented in reports for continuous improvement. Applicable stakeholders, such as the Industrial Advisory Committee, are also updated on key findings to ensure alignment with industry needs and expectations. This collaborative approach ensures that assessment results are integrated into curriculum development and program enhancement.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Packaging Engineering Technology BS

Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	LO is complex, which makes assured and accurate measurement of all the skills and knowledge contained in the LO challenging. Measurement tools should be sufficiently analytical to overcome this issue, or LO should be simplified or otherwise adjusted to be more measurable.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***– in some cases, see notes***	Ensure that the Capstone Exam can be scored specific to the LO and its component parts. If the Capstone Exam measures other LOs as well, the scores for items aligned with LO3 are the only scores that should be reported for LO3, not the composite score. Similarly, ensure that the rubric is able to provide component scores on each of the knowledge/skills described in the complex LO.	Developing

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.	Excellent description of faculty insights into findings.	The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	The performance goals seem to indicate what faculty think students are capable of rather than what students need to demonstrate to be considered proficient. 75% on the rubric may be approaching reasonably high expectations, but 60% on the exam is barely passing.	Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.	Excellent description and rationale for plans to improve assessment data in order to better inform faculty of student mastery of LOs.	Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Exemplary

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	Safety Management	**Date:**	11/13/2024
Author(s):	Andy Perry		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus ___ Distance _X__ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
SO 4 - An ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.	SFTY 416 FA	Discussion board posts and the final project presentation	Preceptor evaluation	70% of the students will score 70/100 or better	79% of students scored 70/100 or better	(NA) No report was completed last year.
SO 5 - An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.	SFTY 416 FA	NA	There was a discussion board activity that was removed from the course; a new assignment will be created for next year.	70% of the students will score 70/100 or better	NA	(NA) No report was completed last year.
SO 6 - An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.	SFTY 416 FA	Assignment three: writing hazard and risk assessment and treatment policy and conducting 3 risk assessments	Rubric	70% of the students will score 70/100 or better	79% of students scored 70/100 or better	(NA) No report was completed last year.
SO 4 - An ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.	SFTY 446 SP	Discussion board assignment	Discussion 2 Answer Key	70% of the students will score 70/100 or better	50% of students scored 70/100 or better (2/6 students did not complete the assignment)	(NA) No report was completed last year.

SO 5 - An ability to understand ethical and professional responsibilities and the impact of technical and/or scientific solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.	SFTY 446 SP	Discussion board assignment	Discussion 4 Answer Key	70% of the students will score 70/100 or better	50% of the students scored 70/100 or better (3/6 students did not complete the assignment)	(NA) No report was completed last year.
SO 6 - An ability to function effectively on teams that establish goals, plan tasks, meet deadlines, and analyze risk and uncertainty.	SFTY 446 SP	NA	There was a group activity for on-campus sections (not for this semester due to low enrollment); a new assignment will be created for next year.	70% of the students will score 70/100 or better	NA	(NA) No report was completed last year.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	Due to Discussion assessments not being of a high point value, some students do not complete them and are not heavily penalized. Two of the outcomes in two different classes had assignments that have been removed for different reasons. It is being planned to replace them to better measure those outcomes in future semesters for both online and on-campus sections.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	Enrollment in the On-campus SM program is trending down in recent years. Average total credits to degree and average years to graduation are up from last year to this year. Admissions applications continue to be lower in recent years.
What student success indicators are concerning?	The lack of participation for some Discussion assignments, likely due to low point values toward the overall point total.

Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	Although enrollment and time to graduate/credit hours have increased, the student learning outcomes are showing we are successful in meeting or exceeding our performance benchmarks.

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	(NA) There was no report from last year.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Increasing enrollment and increasing retention
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	Increased efforts are needed to market/promote a degree/career in Safety Management. Additional human and financial resources are needed due to Dr. Blyukher retiring and Dr. Moayed not teaching in the program. The Program has been approved to hire a new tenure-track faculty to start SP25.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	SO 1, 3, & 4 No changes are planned.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	Faculty will meet in Program Meetings, Department Meetings, and Advisory Council meetings to share with other stakeholders in the program, department, and others.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Safety Management BS
Evaluation: Developing

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)	SO5 & SO6 are fairly compound, making them harder to accurately assess for all aspects of knowledge/skill/contexts described in each. Consider revising for measurability or ensure that tools for evaluation are complex enough to break these into composite parts for scoring.	Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.		Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) ***– in some cases, see notes*** Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.) ***– in some cases, see notes***	SO6 is a bit wonky in that it has defined skills to measure, but situates them in the specific context of the team. In SFTY 416 FA, did the rubric evaluate both the ability to do what the rubric says (goal setting, planning, etc.) AND teamwork, or did it look at just one aspect? To be true to the rubric it really should do the former, and then component scores for each could be reported rather than just one composite score. Similarly, are discussion board posts enough to determine for SO5 that students can demonstrate their understanding in global, economic, environmental, and societal	Developing

			contexts? It's possible, but that seems like a lot.	
Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	You can remove students who did not complete an assignment from the reported data (but still note the number who didn't complete). That way your data reflect LO mastery, not altered by assignment completion. 70% seems like an average performance goal, rather than a reasonably high expectation.	Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders		Developing

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports 2023-24

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports **(SOASRs)** are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 23-24**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. Complete EITHER the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

Submit any time, no later than November 22, 2024

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DEAN REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Program Profile data for Part 2 of the report is finalized after fall semester census and will be available on the Assessment & Accreditation Sycamore Root & in Blue Reports around September 9.

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate/Assistant Dean, as guidelines vary.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson: kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or at extension 7975.

Academic Program:	MS in Technology Management	**Date:**	11/19/2024
Author(s):	Randy Peters		
Given the ongoing changes to the university website, this year's report does not ask you to indicate whether assessment documents on the university website are up to date. If the program learning outcomes, curriculum map, or assessment plan have been updated in the past year, please submit copies of the updated documents with this report.			
How is this program offered? If "Both," data should be disaggregated by campus and distance students to ensure any outcome differences by modality can be examined.	___ Campus ___ Distance __X_ Both		

1. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand/add table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	**Assessment Strategies Used**			**Established Performance Goal**	**Actual Student Performance Relative to Goal**	**Prior Results for Comparison**
	Course	**Assignment/Activity**	**Evaluation Tool** i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
Communicate effectively in the technical environment	ET 697 Project or ET 699 Thesis	1. Major project 2. Comp Exam 3. Exit Survey	1. Rubric 2. Rubric 3. Survey	AVG > 3.5 on a 1-5 scale for each instrument	1. Avg 5.0 – all 5 scoring 5 2. Avg 5.0 – all 5 scoring 5 3. Not administered	Comprehensive exams received were reviewed and found adequate.
Ability to solve problems individually and as a team member	ET 697 Project or ET 699 Thesis	1. Major project 2. Comp Exam 3. Exit Survey	1. Rubric 2. Rubric 3. Survey	AVG > 3.5 on a 1-5 scale for each instrument	1. Avg 5.0 – all 5 scoring 5 2. Avg 5.0 – all 5 scoring 5 3. Not administered	Comprehensive exams received were reviewed and found adequate.
Demonstrates appropriate professional and ethical behavior	ET 697 Project or ET 699 Thesis	1. Major project 2. Comp Exam 3. Exit Survey	1. Rubric 2. Rubric 3. Survey	AVG > 3.5 on a 1-5 scale for each instrument	1. Avg 5.0 – all 5 scoring 5 2. Avg 5.0 – all 5 scoring 5 3. Not administered	Comprehensive exams received were reviewed and found adequate.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings of student learning outcomes assessment. What is going well, and what needs to be monitored or addressed?	The comprehensive exam and the major projects were all deemed scholarly, achieving an average of 5.0 out of a possible 5 score for all five graduates. This seems to indicate the new assessment procedures may be producing appropriate assessment data for accurate reporting. However, since this is the first year of the new assessment plan, we need to continue to review data and analyze for continuous improvement.

2. Student Success Data Trends

Department Chairs will receive and disseminate Program Profiles at the beginning of each fall semester. The data in these profiles summarizes trends in institutional markers of student success such recruitment, enrollment, retention, persistence, and graduation. Department and program trends in staffing and finance are also shared for review of resources and program sustainability. Data should be reviewed and discussed by program faculty, and insights should be documented in this section.

What student success indicators are strong or trending positively?	We had significantly more admits to the program than previous years. We are seeing an uptick in on campus students. This is both encouraging and problematic at the same time. Encouraging as students on-campus are typically full time and therefore take 9 credits per semester. On-campus students may be able to become GA's or TA's augmenting and helping faculty.
What student success indicators are concerning?	We are seeing an uptick in on campus students. This is both encouraging and problematic at the same time. Problematic as many of the on-campus students also require face-2-face courses as they are international students. Offering low enrolled courses in both face-to-face and distance modes is challenging. Hopefully, we will increase numbers in the MSTM program to accommodate and allow for improved scheduling.
Share additional relevant student success data not included in the Program Data Profile. *If faculty need access to or assistance in navigating Blue Reports to view additional data or disaggregate data by student demographic, contact Kelley Woods-Johnson or Institutional Research (https://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/).*	Through repeated information sessions we are seeing an increase in 4+1 students leading to increased enrollment in the program. Although an increase in 4+1 students is desirable, it will have an effect on data as 4+1 students do not appear in blue reports. Further 4+1 students have a significantly faster time to completion, some as little as one trackable fall semester.

3. Continuous Quality Improvement

Review the action plan from the previous year's report and/or the last assessment of these learning outcomes. Provide a brief update of whether these activities appear to have influenced student learning and/or success outcomes.	The assessment instruments were changed as was the admission requirements for the program. Last year there were no graduates for which to obtain assessment data. This year there were five graduates and there appears to be at least five graduates for the upcoming assessment period. This should help with the process.
Based on the findings, what are the top priorities to address and what actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	As we move forward with the next year's assessment it is important that we obtain data from the instructors of ET 697 and ET 699. In addition, we need to be cognizant of administering the Graduate program exit survey.
What support/resources/partnerships (if any) will be explored to achieve these? *Note – this is a planning/reporting tool, not a request for resources. Any potential support identified here should be followed up with consultation with appropriate university officials (e.g., Deans, ISU Foundation, Enrollment Management, etc.).*	

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	We completely revamped the assessment process including the addition of new rubrics to help in determining the attainment of student outcomes. We essentially removed the CTM exam due in part to the revised lack of granularity that is now provided on the exam results. We have kept the same six program outcomes and will focus on the remaining three in accordance with the assessment plan provided.
Describe faculty involvement in assessment and data analysis, and how will findings be shared with faculty and applicable stakeholders?	The faculty were instrumental in reviewing the documentation and providing feedback and support. They voted last year to remove the GRE requirement and voted to change the name of the MSTM program to the MS in Engineering and Technology Management. We believe that the addition of "Engineering" in the title will be more attractive to students with undergraduate engineering degrees. This name change becomes effective in the fall 2025 semester.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 23-24

Program: Technology Management MS
Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		At least one outcome is assessed this cycle Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning Outcome(s) is measurable Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)		Mature
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understanding student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on related tenants and strategies.	Good use of individual and group assessments for measuring LOs that required both types of demonstrations.	Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s) Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s) Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives Assessment data for each outcome comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum Assessment measures include rich and relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.) Tools for evaluating student achievement are appropriate for the type of assessment, effectively isolate independent outcome data, and are clearly described (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)		Mature

Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to performance goals, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.		The established performance goal for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used The established performance goal reflects reasonably high expectations for students in the program Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the established performance goal and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used Faculty insights gained from findings are discussed in thoughtful detail When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery) When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described	<<70% (3.5/5) is a bit low, particularly for a graduate program. <<Probably too few students at this time to disaggregate. Potentially consider doing so in the future if the two distinct (online & on-campus) cohorts continue to grow.	Mature
Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.		Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process (ex: data collection, analysis, reporting, etc.) Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly informed by assessment findings Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty Data from prior assessments of outcomes is reviewed, with changes over time and potential impact of prior interventions or other intervening factors discussed A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders	Good notes on changes to assessment strategies & related rationale. Let me know if I can be of assistance.	Mature