UAA Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee

Agenda: October 21, 2016
11:15am- 12:30pm (note time change), ADM 204
Call: (866) 832-7806 and enter Participant Code: 6243209

1. Approval of Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes

3. Vice Provost report and discussion
   - Accreditation Self Study: Standard 2, Core Theme Open Forums
   - Reminder: Annual Academic Assessment Reports due by October 30, SharePoint site Link

4. Assessment Plan Reviews
   - 12:00pm: Surgical Technology AAS Assessment Plan: New Program: Robin Wahto (page 6)

5. Information Items
   - Mathematics BA/BS Assessment Plan: Informational (page 18)
   - NWCCU Assessment Rubric (page 28)
   - Institutional Self-Study Open Forums: Public Square: Core Theme 5 (page 29)
   - General Education Assessment Workshop 2: Outcomes and Rubric (page 30)
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X = Attendance
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>Assessment Seminar 9:00-12:30</td>
<td>LIB 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>11:30-1:00 (time change)</td>
<td>ADM 201 (room change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>11:15-12:30p (time change)</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18</td>
<td>Cancelled</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>11:00-12:30p</td>
<td>ADM 204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Year 2017 schedule: 1st & 3rd Fridays unless otherwise noted
1. Approval of Agenda
   • Approved

2. Approval of Minutes
   • Approved

3. Assessment Plan Reviews (moved to accommodate program rep’s schedule)
   • 11:15am: Dietetics & Nutrition MS, Program Representative: Carrie King (see page 5)
     • Dietetics & Nutrition MS will actually combine two existing and successful programs: the didactic portion and the internship portion
     • This plan was well-received by the committee

4. Vice Provost report and discussion
   • Accreditation: Self Study
     • Another very good session, >100 people participated
     • Feedback from participants: Not enough time to discuss indicators, so maybe ask each table to discuss one indicator only
     • People continue to get stuck on the data, but the process is really about to what extent are we meeting our mission
     • December session will try to bring everything together
     • UAA 2020 has started with Rashmi Prasad heading it up, connected to the self-reflection that we’re doing related to Self-Study
     • Part of the assessment process also includes looking at and possibly adjusting the Core Themes and indicators
     • There was a lengthy discussion about student success and retention issues following from the activities at the Open Forum this morning
     • There is a student success initiative on campus that is currently looking for the barriers (Strategic Enrollment Management)
     • Reminder: Annual Academic Assessment Reports due by October 30: SharePoint site
     • Almost no file named correctly, so we’re working on that
     • Deans and directors need to look at the reports uploaded from their programs
   • NWCCU Assessment Rubric (informational item below)
     • This document appears on the SharePoint site
     • Committee should be mindful as programs come through of how programs compare with respect to these areas
     • For now, use this as a guide rather than a formal rating process for the programs that come through
     • Need to figure out ways to get this out to more programs
     • As programs come through we can share this with them
5. Next Meeting
   • Assessment plan reviews in the queue: N/A

6. Information Items
   • NWCCU Assessment Rubric (page 22)
     ▪ See discussion above
   • Institutional Self-Study Open Forums (page 23)
   • General Education Assessment Workshop: Curriculum Mapping and Shared Assessment; Friday, October 14th, 10:00am -11:30am, RH 101.
     ▪ Need to extend this discussion more broadly
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Academic Assessment Plan
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The Surgical Technology faculty: October 1, 2016
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October 13, 2016
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MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Surgical Technology AAS program is to prepare competent surgical technologists for successful employment in an operating room, assisting the surgeon and other members of the professional surgical team with patient care before, during, and after surgery.

PROGRAM INTRODUCTION

The UAA Surgical Technology Program is a new AAS program that will be applying for accreditation by the Commission for Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (CAAHEP) upon the recommendation of the Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting (ARC/STSA). CAAHEP accreditation is required in order for graduates of the program to be eligible to sit for the Certified Surgical Technologist (CST) examination. The outcomes identified for the UAA Surgical Technology AAS program are based on Standards and Guidelines for an Accreditation of Educational Programs in Surgical Technology.

These standards and guidelines have been specifically established for CAAHEP accreditation of surgical technology programs. The 2013 Standards have been utilized during the development of the UAA Surgical Technology Program and as the program prepares to submit a self-study and undergo a site visit for program CAAHEP accreditation. Program curriculum and assessments have been aligned with the 2013 CAAHEP-accreditation standards.

Assessment strategies have been chosen to align with identified program student learning outcomes. The Accreditation Review Council on Education in Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting has established specific outcomes and outcome thresholds which must be met by the program in order to maintain CAAHEP accreditation. Several assessment tools identified by the Council, including graduate and employer surveys, are required by CAAHEP for continuing program accreditation. The UAA Surgical Technology Program chooses to include these surveys as assessment tools since the surveys must be completed as a requirement of program accreditation.

PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Students graduating with an Associate of Applied Science in Surgical Technology will be able to:

- apply knowledge and skills of biological sciences in the perioperative setting,
- apply concepts of medical ethics to patients, physicians, and health facility personnel,
- apply the principles of aseptic technique,
- organize routine instrumentation and supplies within the perioperative environment,
- demonstrate skills and behaviors necessary to function as a member of a surgical team.
# Measures

## Table 1: Association of Assessment Measures to Program Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes Assessment Exam</th>
<th>Practicum Evaluation</th>
<th>Skills Evaluation</th>
<th>Employer Survey</th>
<th>Graduate Survey</th>
<th>CST Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge and skills of biological sciences in the perioperative setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply concepts of medical ethics to patients, physicians, and health facility personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply the principles of aseptic technique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize routine instrumentation and supplies within the perioperative environment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate skills and behaviors necessary to function as a member of a surgical team.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = Measure is not used to measure the associated outcome.
1 = Measure is used to measure the associated outcome.
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**ASSESSMENT MEASURES**

A description of the measures used in the assessment of the program student learning outcomes and their implementation are summarized in Table 2 below. The measures and their relationships to the program student learning outcomes are listed in Table 1, above.

**TABLE 2: ASSESSMENT MEASURES AND ADMINISTRATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency/Start Date</th>
<th>Collection Method</th>
<th>Administered by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OAE</td>
<td>Outcomes Assessment Exam – an exam approved by the Accreditation Review Council; required to be given to 100% of the students in a CAAHEP-accredited program</td>
<td>In last semester of program</td>
<td>Computerized exam</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation completed at end of Practicum course by clinical instructors to assess student’s performance in the operating room</td>
<td>Throughout final semester with final report completed at end of final semester</td>
<td>Performance evaluation form</td>
<td>UAA Clinical Coordinator and Practicum Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation completed for each required competency throughout the program</td>
<td>Throughout all SURG courses</td>
<td>Competency Skill Evaluation forms</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Employer Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>No sooner than 9 months after employment</td>
<td>Survey tool established by ARC/STSA</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Survey</td>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td>No sooner than 6 months after graduation</td>
<td>Survey tool established by ARC/STSA</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST Exam</td>
<td>Certification exam for Surgical Technologists</td>
<td>At time of graduation</td>
<td>Computerized exam – scores provided to program</td>
<td>The National Board of Surgical Technology and Surgical Assisting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Outcomes Indicator</td>
<td>Outcomes Assessment Threshold (Minimum Requirement)</td>
<td>Type of Measure</td>
<td>When to Measure</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic Retention</td>
<td>70% of students that are admitted to the program taking core courses must graduate/complete</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Measured upon graduation/program completion</td>
<td>Students who delay graduation beyond their original on-time cohort completion/anticipated graduation date, due to leaves of absence/repeating courses, are considered attrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes Assessment Exam (OAE) Performance</td>
<td>All programs must administer an ARC/STSA-approved OAE to all program graduates</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Final semester of program; within a four (4) week period prior to or after graduation</td>
<td>This threshold does not refer to a class average; it refers to individual student/graduate scores. 100% of completing students must participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST Exam for all CAAHEP-accredited and SCT Exam-eligible programs</td>
<td>100% participation rate and 70% pass rate</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>ARC/STSA Reporting Year = August 1 – July 31</td>
<td>Programs seeking CAAHEP initial accreditation are required to administer the NBSTSA Comprehensive SCT Practice Exam (100% participation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job (Positive) Placement</td>
<td>80% of graduates seeking employment must be employed in a field related to surgical technology</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>At least once within 1 year after graduation</td>
<td>Graduates employed FT or PT in the ST field (or related field/on active military duty/continuing their education are considered positive placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Satisfaction</td>
<td>50% return rate for surveys and 85% of the returned surveys rating the employee at a 3 or higher on a 5 point scale</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>No sooner that 9 months after the graduate’s employment</td>
<td>At least 50% of employers reported under Placement outcomes return the survey tool and 85% of surveys indicate a “satisfactory” rating – 24 of 28 areas rated 3 or higher on a 5 point Likert scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction</td>
<td>50% return rate for surveys and 85% of the returned surveys rating the employee at a 3 or higher on a 5 point scale</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>No sooner than 6 months after graduation</td>
<td>At least 50% of graduates reported under Retention outcomes return the survey tool; 85% of surveys indicate a “satisfactory” rating 7 of 8 areas rated 3 or higher on the 5 point Likert scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Annually, the program will assess its effectiveness in achieving its stated goals, learning domains, and program student learning outcomes. The annual timing of the assessment will align with the timeline established by the program’s accrediting agency, and an assessment report will be submitted to the UAA Office of Academic Affairs per UAA established reporting deadlines.

Data will be gathered by the program director, faculty and clinical coordinator as outlined in the above tables. The data will then be collated by the Program Director and shared with faculty for their review. Recommendations will be made by the Program Director, faculty and clinical coordinator. The recommendations will be discussed among the group, agreed upon and implemented in order that any required revision of the program will be made in a timely manner.

In addition to assessing program student learning outcomes, the program must also meet the outcomes assessment thresholds established by the Accreditation Review Council for Surgical Technologists and Surgical Assistants. These outcome measurements will be determined and reported on an annual report which is required by the Accreditation Review Council.

DEVELOPMENT AND MODIFICATION OF PLAN

Because this assessment plan is for a new program, it will be reviewed as the self-study is prepared for CAAHEP accreditation and as the first cohort of students matriculate through the program. The program director, faculty and clinical coordinator will be involved with the review and revision of the plan. Thereafter, the effectiveness of the plan will be evaluated on an annual basis by the program director, the faculty, and the clinical coordinator. Recommendations for revisions will be reviewed and discussed by the group and revisions made per recommendations for which there is consensus.
Section IV: Student and Graduate (Outcomes) Evaluation/Assessment

Standard IV.A.—Student Evaluation

1. Frequency and purpose: Evaluation of students must be conducted on a recurrent basis and with sufficient frequency to provide both the students and program faculty with valid and timely indications of the students' progress toward and achievement of the competencies and learning domains stated in the curriculum.

2. Documentation: Records of student evaluations must be maintained in sufficient detail to document learning progress and achievements.

[Please see the 2013 CAAHEP Standards at the back of this document for guidelines/additional information regarding compliance with this Standard.]

EXAMPLE—Standard IV.A.—

Example of a Laboratory Skills Evaluation Rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name:</th>
<th>SURG102—Lab Skill 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The learner will assemble an unguarded surgical scalpel accurately, safely, and with proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Not Successful</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Selects the required #15 blade</td>
<td>Correct blade, handle, and needle holder = 3 points</td>
<td>1 of 3 incorrect = 2 points</td>
<td>2 or 3 of 3 incorrect = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Selects the corresponding #7 knife handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Selects a 6&quot; Mayo Hewson Needle Holder to use in loading the blade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Needs Work</th>
<th>Not Successful</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Places thumb and fourth finger into needle holder finger rings</td>
<td>Steps performed in order; timely, safe and accurate performance = 3 points</td>
<td>1-2 Steps need repeating; 1-2 minutes to complete all steps, safe performance = 2 points</td>
<td>Multiple steps need repeating — OR — greater than 2 minutes to complete steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Orient the blade using the jaw of the needle holder with the cutting area facing left and the cutting tip pointing away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Grasps the blade just above the fenestration and at a slight angle to the shaft of the needle holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Orient the knife handle with the blade retaining section pointing away and the beveled area facing up; the hand holds the handle on the lower half of the handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Blade is grasped firmly with the jaw of the needle holder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The flared section of the blade fenestration is aligned with the grooves of the blade handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The blade is released; the needle holder is stored in its appropriate location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The scalpel/handle is stored in &quot;sharps&quot; section of the back table, pointing away from the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Performs steps in order without repeating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Performs all steps in less than 60 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Performs in less than 3 attempts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Faculty Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
ARC/STSA
GRADUATE SURVEY for Surgical Technology Education

Date ______________________________________

Name of Surgical Technology program ________________________________________________

Name of graduate _________________________________________________________________

Date of graduation _______________________________________________________________

Place of employment ________________________________________________________________

Are you certified?  □ Yes  □ No

If yes, what is the date of your certification __________________________________________

Are you continuing your education? □ Yes  □ No

If yes, what institution are you attending _____________________________________________

What degree are you working toward? _________________________________________________

Please rate the following items according to this scale:
                     5 = Strongly Agree,  4 = Agree,  3 = Somewhat Agree,  2 = Disagree,  1 = Strongly Disagree

1. The didactic portion of the program adequately prepared me for my present position.  1  2  3  4  5

2. The clinical portion of the program adequately prepared me for my present position.  1  2  3  4  5

3. The program adequately prepared me for the certification exam.  1  2  3  4  5

4. Program officials were available for assistance.  1  2  3  4  5

5. Program officials were sensitive to student needs, and treated students equally and with respect.  1  2  3  4  5

6. Program officials were supportive of the students, and provided constructive evaluations.  1  2  3  4  5

7. Program officials were competent, knowledgeable, and well-prepared for instruction. Questions and independent thinking were encouraged.  1  2  3  4  5

8. Program policies and procedures were clearly defined and enforced.  1  2  3  4  5
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9. What do you feel were the strengths of the program?


10. What do you feel were the weaknesses of the program?


11. If you could make changes in the program, what would you change?


12. What portions of the program would you keep, and why?


13. General Comments About Your Education


Signature of Graduate


~ Thank you! ~
ARC/STSA EMPLOYER SATISFACTION SURVEY
CAAHEP-Accredited Surgical Technology Program

Surgical technology (ST) programs value the opinions of employers of our graduates. The information provided in this survey is critical to continuous quality improvement of the program. Employer survey return rate and Employer survey satisfaction rate are two of the program outcomes reported to the institution’s Program Advisory Committee and on the program’s ARC/STSA Annual Report. Thank you for completing and returning this important survey.

School Sponsoring ST Program

__________________________ State ________________

Graduate’s Name ____________________________ Graduation Date _________

Employer ____________________________ Dept. ________________

Date of employment ____________________________ Length of Employment (months or years) ____________________________

Please select one response from the KEY below and circle the corresponding number at the end of each question.

KEY: 0=Does Not Apply, 1=Not Satisfied, 2=Slightly Satisfied, 3=Satisfied, 4=Very Satisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

Knowledge (Cognitive Preparation) - How satisfied are you with this graduate’s entry-level knowledge of:

1. basic sciences (e.g., anatomy, physiology, medical terminology, pathophysiology, microbiology, pharmacology, and anesthesia)? 0 1 2 3 4 5

2. preoperative concepts (e.g., case preparation, scrubbing, gowning, gloving, and counting)? 0 1 2 3 4 5

3. intra-operative concepts (e.g., operative sequence, supplies, instrumentation, equipment, and specimen handling)? 0 1 2 3 4 5

4. postoperative concepts (e.g., case breakdown/room turnover, transfer/transport, decontamination, disinfection, and sterilization)? 0 1 2 3 4 5

Psychomotor Skills - How satisfied are you with this graduate’s entry-level skills:

5. ability to anticipate, manage a surgical procedure, and handle instrumentation, supplies, and equipment? 0 1 2 3 4 5

6. practice of asepsis, standard precautions, and sharps safety? 0 1 2 3 4 5

Professional Behaviors - How satisfied are you with this graduate’s entry-level behavior:

7. work ethic (e.g., attendance, punctuality, time management, and accountability)? 0 1 2 3 4 5

8. interpersonal skills (e.g., communication, teamwork, and conflict management)? 0 1 2 3 4 5

9. adaptive behaviors (e.g., flexibility, receptiveness to critique, and responsiveness to stressful situations)? 0 1 2 3 4 5

10. Overall, how satisfied are you with this graduate’s preparation for entry-level employment? 0 1 2 3 4 5
Please comment on areas above where you were less than satisfied and/or on how the program can improve the overall quality of its graduates (optional).

Date this survey was completed ____________________________
Name of person completing survey ______________________________________________________
Job Title of person completing survey _____________________________________________________
Signature of person completing survey _____________________________________________________
Email address ____________________________ Primary phone number _________________________

End of Survey

Thank you!
Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics

Assessment Plan

Revised October 2016
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Mission Statement

The mission of the Mathematics program is to inspire our students to develop the knowledge and skills to understand, communicate and apply mathematical ideas, through excellence in instruction, quality research and scholarly activities, valuable and expert resources to the community, curriculum, and academic advising.

Program Introduction

There is no special accreditation available for mathematics programs in the United States. The CUPM (Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics) under the umbrella of the Mathematical Association of America develops guidelines for Mathematics Programs (current revision 2015).

Assessment Process

This document defines the expected student learning outcomes for the Mathematics program and outlines a plan for assessing the achievement of the stated student learning outcomes. The assessment uses three tools: student program portfolios, an exit survey, and the ETS Major Field Test.

The use of student program portfolios began in Fall 2011. These portfolios over time collect evidence of student achievement of the ability to understand, communicate, and apply mathematics. Descriptions of their philosophy of learning and interest in continuing to learn and use their skills are collected in required portfolio elements.

The exit survey began in Fall 2001. The exit survey was intended to determine how graduating majors perceived the department, its faculty, academic advising, and the quality of the program. Minor modifications to the survey have been made to provide more useful information to the department and to account for the portfolio which includes some of the information.

The program requirement that a mathematics major must take a standardized test of knowledge in order to graduate became effective as of the 2002-2003 catalog. The mathematics faculty decided to require the ETS Mathematics Major Field test which is administered by over 300 mathematics programs in the United States.

The mathematics faculty met and accepted the current student learning outcomes and assessment process in September 2012, and has accepted the process, report, and plan each fall semester. A committee was instituted in AY2016 to review the portfolios and provide initial feedback on the assessment report. The assessment report is reviewed each academic year by the mathematics faculty.
# Mathematics Baccalaureate Degree Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrate knowledge of the techniques of modern mathematical subjects including calculus, linear algebra, abstract algebra, real analysis, discrete mathematics, and probability and statistics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to construct proofs and solve problems using deductive logic, data analysis, computation, modeling, and connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to read, write, and speak mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate cognizance of their mathematical knowledge, of mathematics around them, and the need for life-long learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assessment Measures**

A description of the measures used in the assessment of the program student learning outcomes and their implementation are summarized below. The measures and their relationships to the program student learning outcomes are also listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency/ Start Date</th>
<th>Collection Method</th>
<th>Administered by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Program Portfolios</strong></td>
<td>Portfolios contain statements of goals, reflections on classes and materials from classes.</td>
<td>Students begin to construct their portfolio in MATH A265. Portfolios are collected and reviewed the semester before they graduate and the semester they graduate.</td>
<td>Students submit the portfolios using the eWolf system to faculty of MATH A265 and to the program assessment committee.</td>
<td>All mathematics faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Exit Survey</strong></td>
<td>The survey consists of fourteen questions and is administered to students in their senior year</td>
<td>Administered every fall and spring semester.</td>
<td>The surveys are administered using Qualtrics.</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETS Major Field Test</strong></td>
<td>National standardized test</td>
<td>Administered every fall and spring semester.</td>
<td>A Mathematics faculty member supervises students taking the test online.</td>
<td>Assessment Coordinator or designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Program Portfolios</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exit Survey</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standardized Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate knowledge of the techniques of modern mathematical subjects including calculus, linear algebra, abstract algebra, discrete mathematics, analysis, and probability and statistics.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to construct proofs and solve problems using deductive logic, data analysis, computation, modeling, and connections.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate an ability to read, write, and speak mathematics.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate cognizance of their mathematical knowledge, of mathematics around them, and their need for life-long learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = Measure is not used to measure the associated outcome.

1 = Measure is used to measure the associated outcome.
**Assessment Implementation & Analysis for Program Improvement**

**General Implementation Strategy**

Implementation of the plan revolves around the Student Program Portfolios, the exit survey for graduating majors, and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Major Field Test. The Student Program Portfolios are collected in MATH A265 and in the student’s last two semesters. The Major Field Test is administered every fall and spring semester. Students are encouraged to take the test in their penultimate semester. The exit survey is distributed using Qualtrics every term as needed.

All mathematics majors must submit a portfolio and take the ETS Major Field Test in order to graduate, and all graduating majors receive the exit survey.

**Recommendations for Program or Assessment Improvement**

The program assessment committee meets at the end of each semester to review portfolios. At the end of the spring semester they also review the assessment report and provide suggestions before it is submitted. Early in the fall semester, the mathematics program faculty are asked to review the assessment report. The program assessment committee or other faculty may recommend modifications of either the assessment tools or the program based on the results.

Recent changes include the following.

- revision of the major to ensure proper breadth, because students were avoiding certain classes
- reminders to the faculty to remember and mention student learning outcomes in their courses including the need to regularly add to the portfolio
Appendix A: Senior Exit Survey

Measure Description:
A ten question survey is administered to graduating majors to gather information about the quality of the Mathematics programs, department, faculty, academic advising, and why the student selected the major.

Factors that affect the collected data:
The response rate to the survey affect the representative nature of the data.

How to interpret the data:
The data provides information on whether students are satisfied with the educational experience provided by the program.
Exit Survey

Every semester the Department of Mathematics & Statistics requests graduates to provide feedback on the program. We use the results to help us evaluate the quality of our undergraduate program. Please take a few minutes to fill out this survey. Your responses are confidential.

1. Which type of degree did you receive? Bachelor of Arts Mathematics or Bachelor of Science Mathematics

2. Why did you choose a Bachelor of Arts (instead of a Bachelor of Science) or a Bachelor of Science (instead of a Bachelor of Arts)?

3. What are the major strengths of the department?

4. In what areas could the department improve?

5. How satisfied are you with the overall quality of your mathematics and statistics courses?

6. Please elaborate on why you are or are not satisfied with the courses.

7. List any mathematics or statistics courses that were not offered or not offered regularly at UAA that you would have liked. Explain why.

8. Did you have adequate access to the faculty in the Department Mathematics and Statistics? This includes for classes, advising, and any other interactions.

9. Please explain why you did or did not have adequate access to the faculty.

10. How satisfied were you with the quality of advising in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics?

11. Please explain why you were or were not satisfied with the advising.

12. If there are any additional comments that you would like to make concerning your undergraduate education, please add them below.
Appendix B: ETS Major Field Test

Tool Description:

The ETS Major Field Test in Mathematics is designed to measure the basic knowledge and understanding achieved by senior undergraduates in mathematics. In addition to factual knowledge, the test evaluates students’ abilities to analyze and solve problems, understand relationships, and interpret material. The ETS Major Field Test can be used by program faculty to evaluate their curricula and to measure the progress of their students. The tests also provide students with an assessment of their own level of achievement within the discipline of mathematics compared to that of students in their program and to national comparative data. Content areas covered on the test include Calculus (30%), Linear and Abstract Algebra (30%), Advanced Calculus, Real and Complex Analysis, Discrete Mathematics, Probability and Statistics, Dynamical Systems, Topology, Geometry, Differential Equations, and Numerical Analysis (40%). Changes are made to the ETS tests periodically to reflect current curriculum trends.

ETS major field tests are confidential, and sample tests are not permitted to be viewed except under strict security conditions.

Factors that affect the collected data:

Student motivation. There is currently no requirement that students have to obtain a specific grade on the standardized test. This raises the possibility that students will not spend time preparing for the test or take the test seriously.

How to interpret the data:

A Comparative Data Guide, published each year, contains tables of scale scores and percentiles for individual student scores, departmental mean scores, and any sub scores or group assessment indicators that the tests may support. Overall student scores are reported on a scale of 120-200. The Subject Test has been required as a graduation requirement since the 2002-2003 catalogs.

The test is administered on the last Fridays of October and March, so that the information is available for graduation audits to be completed if students fail to take the exam prior to their final semester.
### Rubric for Evaluating Outcomes Assessment Plan and Progress

**DRAFT ONLY for NWCCU 2016 MCE Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Planning</strong></td>
<td>No formal assessment plan</td>
<td>Relies on intermittent planning</td>
<td>Clear regular plan</td>
<td>Clear multi-year plan with several years of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Non-specific outcomes. Do not state student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Most outcomes indicate how students demonstrate learning</td>
<td>Each outcome describes student demonstration of learning</td>
<td>Outcomes describe demonstration of student learning. Outcomes used for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Not clear that assessment data is collected</td>
<td>Evidence collected Faculty have discussed relevant criteria for reviewing</td>
<td>Evidence is collected and faculty use relevant criteria</td>
<td>Evidence collected, criteria determined and faculty discuss multiple sets of data. Data is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td>No clear relationship between outcomes and curriculum</td>
<td>Some alignment between curriculum and outcomes</td>
<td>Clear alignment between curriculum and outcomes</td>
<td>Curriculum, grading and support services are aligned with outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid Results</strong></td>
<td>Little to no evidence that measures are valid</td>
<td>Majority of measures are valid</td>
<td>Valid measures in regular use</td>
<td>Multi-year use of valid measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliable Results</strong></td>
<td>No process to check for inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>Faculty preparing inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>Faculty check for inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>Multi-year use of process and evidence of good inter-rater reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</strong></td>
<td>No person or committee provides feedback to departments on quality of their assessment plan</td>
<td>Occasional feedback by person or committee</td>
<td>Annual feedback by person or committee. Departments use feedback.</td>
<td>Annual feedback, departmental use and institutional support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results are Used</strong></td>
<td>Results for outcomes are collected but not discussed.</td>
<td>Results collected, discussed but not used</td>
<td>Results collected, discussed and used.</td>
<td>Results collected, discussed, used and evidence to confirm that changes lead to improved learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Budgeting</strong></td>
<td>Outcomes not integrated into planning and budget</td>
<td>Attempts at aligning outcomes and planning and budget</td>
<td>Alignment of outcomes and planning and budget occurs informally</td>
<td>Alignment of outcomes and planning is systematic and intentional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Register Now

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Core Theme Five Open Forum:
Public Square

Friday, October 21, 2016
9:00 -11:00 a.m. in LIB 307

Registration and Coffee Starting at 8:30

How are we doing?
What are our hidden stories about Core Theme 5: Public Square at UAA?
How does this affect our planning?

RSVP today through the links below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Open Forum</th>
<th>Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10/21</td>
<td>Public Square (Core Theme 5)</td>
<td>[Register]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10/28</td>
<td>UAA Community (Core Theme 4)</td>
<td>[Register]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 11/4</td>
<td>Research, Scholarship, &amp; Creative Activity (Core Theme 2)</td>
<td>[Register]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 12/2</td>
<td>Bringing It All Together: Summary of All Core Theme Sessions</td>
<td>[Register]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2/24</td>
<td>Core Theme Discussion of Findings</td>
<td>[Register]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unless otherwise indicated, the open forums will be held from 9:00-11:00 in LIB 307. The open forums will be available by distance to the community campuses.

Questions? Please contact Academic Affairs at uaa_oaa@uaa.alaska.edu.
AY2017 General Education Assessment Workshop Series

A map does not just chart, it unlocks and formulates meaning; it forms bridges between here and there, between disparate ideas that we did not know were previously connected.

-Reif Larsen

Building on September’s General Education Open Forum, Dan Kline (Director of General Education) will lead a series of workshops for faculty from across UAA (1) to develop a curriculum map of their majors and programs, (2) to align their programs and majors to UAA GER outcomes, (3) to create assignments and rubrics to evaluate Student Learning Outcomes, and (4) to map out an approach to assessment that fosters the programs and majors as well as the GER assessment required by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities’ reaffirmation of UAA’s accreditation.

Throughout the process, we will be developing practical tools for curriculum mapping and assessment, and at the end of the CAFE series, we hope to have a group of programs and majors that are willing to pilot this assessment process in Spring 2017.

Last year, the GER Curriculum Mapping Workshops led to further development of a shared rubric which can be used in both GER courses and by programs to assess outcomes in Written Communication, Oral Communication, and Information Literacy. This year’s workshops will lead to the creation of shared rubrics in Social Sciences, Humanities, and Fine Arts.

You do not need to have attended the General Education Open Forum, nor do you have to attend all three CAFE sessions to benefit from the discussion. The workshop series will be repeated in Spring 2017. All faculty, programs, and majors are invited – from certificates and associate degrees to baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral degrees.

Facilitator: Dan Kline, Director, General Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Forum/Workshop</th>
<th>Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fri 10/14</td>
<td>General Education Assessment Workshop 1: Curriculum Mapping &amp; Shared Assessment – RH 101</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 11/11</td>
<td>General Education Assessment Workshop 2: Outcomes and Rubric</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 11/18</td>
<td>General Education Assessment Workshop 3: Rubric and Student Work</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 12/9</td>
<td>General Education Open Forum</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs 1/12</td>
<td>General Education Salon – 9:00-12:00</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 2/10</td>
<td>General Education Assessment Workshop 1: Curriculum Mapping &amp; Shared Assessment</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 3/10</td>
<td>General Education Assessment Workshop 2: Outcomes and Rubric</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 4/14</td>
<td>General Education Assessment Workshop 3: Rubric and Student Work</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 5/8 and</td>
<td>General Education Soiree – Times TBD</td>
<td>Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 5/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unless otherwise indicated, the General Education Workshops and Forums will be held from 10:00-11:30 a.m. in LIB 307.

Questions? Contact Dr. Dan Kline, General Education Director, at 786-4364 or dtkline@alaska.edu. Questions about connecting by distance? Email uaa_oaa@uaa.alaska.edu.

Co-sponsored by the General Education Advisory Committee (GERA), the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), and the Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence (CAFE).