

**Review of Assessment Report
Assessment Review Committee (ARC)**

Academic Program: Mathematics

Date: **September 2017**

Criteria for Evaluating Assessment Reports

Criteria	Description of Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary	Comments from Assessment Review Committee
SLOs	The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) establish the critical components of student learning that define the program and articulate the knowledge and abilities expected of program graduates in ways that are observable and measurable.			X		In last year's evaluation, you were encouraged to refine your LOs to focus on student's understanding. This year, you have significantly improved your LOs and learning goals. The assessment review committee was pleased with your LOs and only suggested eliminating both LO1 and G1.
Evidence of Student Learning	Results are based upon evidence of student learning, and evidence can be provided to both internal and external reviewers (preferably in electronic form)				X	Relevant results and evidence of student learning were provided.
Meaningful Rubrics	Criteria for successful performance are provided through rubrics or other specific descriptions.			X		All members of the review committee agreed that your program had one of the best examples of rubrics for scoring successful performance. The criteria match the program goals (especially when you eliminate G1).

MATH/CSCI
Assessment Reports, 2016-17
Fall 2017

Email from Pmeidlin@drury.edu to Keith Coates and Albert Korir

Hi Keith,

Thanks to you and your faculty for preparing the assessment report, and thanks to Drs. Simmons and Robertson for participating in the Assessment Review Committee's evaluation process. I have attached the evaluation of MATH and SCSi 2016-17 reports from ARC. CSCI is moving in the right direction, and we appreciate their acknowledging that they still need to get better, and we share their optimism that, as the new programs continue to develop, the assessment approach will develop alongside it.

The MATH assessment report does some good things--you have meaningful rubrics and important goals, but two big pieces are missing here, and these might be the central points of discussion in your faculty-wide assessment meetings: 1) what conclusions can you draw about courses that fulfill CORE requirements? That is, you focus on your majors, but it is also important that we know how well students are doing in MATH 205, 227, 230, and 231--the courses non-majors take for CORE credit. We want to see assessment data for them next year.

2) what are you going to do with the assessment to get better at helping students learn? We didn't see enough reflection on that question in your assessment report. It's the idea that assessment should shape practice -- pedagogy or curriculum. How does your work shape your faculty's practice in the coming year?

We would like to close the loop on assessment by asking all faculty in the department to read your own assessment report from 2016-17 (if they haven't already), read ARC's evaluation of their report (this email and the attached document), and then have a discussion about the findings of both. We would like the department to send a summary of that discussion to Peter Meidlinger in the OAA.

We hope faculty discussion of this process puts student learning at the heart of the life of the school/department. This is an excellent opportunity for faculty to consider the process they have put in place, to remind themselves what learning outcomes they are assessing this year and in which courses, and to review the process by which they will gather and assess student learning.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this. Thanks!