This is the third annual report on student learning outcomes assessment prepared by the Assessment Committee of NYIT’s Academic Senate for use by the NYIT community. The purpose of these annual reports is to draw attention to assessment-related actions and outcomes by the committee, the faculty, and the administration during the year and to make suggestions for improvement. The ultimate goal is to improve student learning at NYIT.

The Assessment Committee of NYIT’s Academic Senate is the institutional unit that brings together all program assessment activities at the university - for programs with and without professional accreditation, for programs at all locations, for programs given through all delivery mechanisms. The committee members come from all academic schools and numerous support departments. Its meetings are open and minutes are posted.

2010-2011 Outcomes

- 96% of academic programs submitted Assessment Plans for AY 2010-2011 and reported on the assessment activities and analyses they undertook during the year, the conclusions they drew, and the actions they took to improve student learning.

- Assessment Committee members reviewed, discussed and provided feedback to faculty and deans.

- Institution-wide baseline data for the assessment of one undergraduate core learning outcome was collected and analyzed institution-wide and a second core outcome was studied in a freshman foundation course; based on these pilot efforts, the committee made revisions in the plan for core assessment for AY 2011-2012.

- Meaningful assessment work went on at all global campuses except Nanjing.

ANNUAL PROCESS FOR STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT IN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The elements of NYIT’s annual process for assessing student learning outcomes in academic programs are:
Faculty members create annual assessment plans: they agree on which aspects of their programs will be assessed and how, assign responsibilities, and establish timelines.

In addition to program-specific outcomes, assessment plans for undergraduate programs also include assessment of a core learning outcome designated by the Assessment Committee to be examined across the university.

Assessment plans for the year are submitted to the committee, which reviews and discusses them and provides feedback to the dean and program faculty.

The plan is implemented: data are collected and analyzed and an improvement action plan is developed.

Assessment reports for the year, summarizing the assessment activities, analyses, and improvement plans are submitted to the committee, which reviews these documents and provides feedback.

To enable sharing of best practice, plans and reports for each program continue to be posted on the Planning and Assessment web site where they are available to all faculty (http://www.nyi.edu/planning/outcomes_assessment/academic_assessment/)

A summary of AY 2010-11 actions follows:

**School of Architecture and Design**

**Architecture.** Completed work for reaccreditation from NAAB. Visiting team found all conditions met. “The team finds this is a strong program with measurable progress made since the last visit. This was confirmed in discussions with faculty, students, and administration, and is clearly evident as described in the APR and confirmed during the visit.” Action items and timeframes will be finalized after the NAAB Board issues its final report.

**Interior Design.** Faculty work focused on re-alignment of course learning outcomes with new standards issued by its accrediting agency, CIDA.

**College of Arts and Sciences**

**Advertising.** Faculty evaluated and analyzed student work from 3 sections of ADVT 101 (two held in traditional classrooms and one online) to assess performance on the learning outcome “Critically analyze the historical, social and cultural impact of the media on our global society.” The strength of the work in the online class led the faculty to plan to introduce online materials and interaction as supplements to the on-ground classes. All full-time and some adjunct instructors will be encouraged to attend Blackboard workshops with the goal of having an online component of 25 - 30% of the offerings by fall 2012.

**Behavioral Sciences/ Psychology/Criminal Justice.** Faculty collected and analyzed data from eight courses regarding the program outcome: “upon graduation students will effectively communicate course material orally” using a grading rubric they developed
for the oral presentation (direct measure). They also developed and administered a student survey about their experience doing the oral presentation. Faculty were satisfied with the outcomes in the psychology and sociology classes; however close to 40% of criminal justice students’ presentations were rated “poor” and introduction of seminar classes in the major was discussed as a possible remedy. More research is needed. They also developed an alumni survey which was sent to graduates from 2008 – 2010 during the spring to be analyzed during 2011-2012.

**Communication Arts.** Faculty evaluated and analyzed samples of student work from JOUR 101 (Introduction to Journalism) & COMM 350 (Special Events seminar) to assess performance on the learning outcome: “Research, evaluate, organize and convey information to a variety of audiences in written, oral and visual forms.” Actions include: for freshmen, introduce at least one additional paper into the syllabus and encourage students to make use of the writing center; for the more advanced level, introduce written case studies that students prepare and critique.

**Fine Arts.** In response to recommendations made following an external program review at NYIT’s location in Abu Dhabi, the Fine Arts faculty revised the degree map for the BFA in Computer Graphics – to improve sequencing and to add topics that were missing or covered in insufficient depth, developed syllabi for the new courses, and revised syllabi for courses in the first and second semesters (courses for subsequent terms will be completed in AY 2011-2012).

**Interdisciplinary Studies.** Faculty focus was on IDSP Standard #4, “By the time of graduation, students in the Interdisciplinary Studies Program should be able to define what a discipline is and what interdisciplinary research is.” Low scores on the criterion measure indicate that graduating students have difficulty in understanding interdisciplinary work at the college level. Faculty will work with admissions to develop a better student profile in the Interdisciplinary Studies major and create standards for admission and continuation that are in line with those of other programs at NYIT.

**Life Sciences.** No report

**Political Science.** Administered exit exam and alumni survey; evaluated and assessed writing skills in political science term papers. Given the small number of majors, individual consultations were held and improvement plans were developed with students.

**School of Education**

**Teacher Education:** Faculty analyzed teachers’ work samples over several years using a 3 point scale. The 2010 assessment showed that changes made in prior years (to teaching methods and course content) led to improved scores for four outcomes: aligning content goals with national, state or local standards; making appropriate accommodations to meet student needs; interpreting pre/post data regarding student learning and making conclusions based on their experience. Going forward will be changes to the literacy
instruction requirements for the capstone assignment and mapping of both literacy and parent/community involvement through the curriculum.

**Instructional Technology.** Faculty examined three learning outcomes: Technology skills, Field Experience and Impact on P-12 student learning. Feedback from external reviewers had suggested that the assessments being used provided “insufficient differentiation about the quality of [students’] performance and the effectiveness of the experience.” Faculty reviewed the rubrics and associated data and came to the same conclusion; they now plan to revise the rubrics this fall to provide better information about student performance on these outcomes.

**School Counseling.** Faculty participated in two retreat days and assessed the program competencies and learner outcomes for each of the 14 required courses as part of our preparation for NCATE accreditation. It was determined that students need additional focused work in the application of counseling skills. A new course was proposed and approved to specifically provide the practical application of theory.

**School of Engineering and Computing Sciences**

**Computer Science.** Faculty reassessed performance in areas where interventions were made the prior year and found improved performance in (1) understanding of computer organization, architecture and operating systems, (2) understanding of the need for continuing professional development, and, to a lesser extent, in (3) team work. As a result, faculty teaching courses that contribute to the teamwork program outcome will not allow individual projects in their respective courses and will turn in their assessments in a timely manner. In addition, surveys of Alumni and Employers are planned for AY 2011-12.

**Electrical and Computer Engineering.** Faculty focus was on two student outcomes with a score less than 1.5: SO2 (An ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data) and SO10 (A knowledge of contemporary issues). They also planned surveys for both Alumni and Employers for AY 2011-12.

**Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology.** Faculty studied graduating students’ “ability to communicate verbally and in writing throughout the curriculum [outcome “g”]) along with all other programs at NYIT. To improve writing in the major, faculty agreed to at least one more writing assignment per course in spring 2011 which would be marked up not only for their technical content, but also for grammar and spelling and writing style. They conducted their annual review of program outcomes. Improvement actions include: modernization of software/hardware in some courses and some changes to course content. In addition, the program had a successful accreditation visit from ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) in fall 2010 and all visiting team recommendations were implemented.
Informational Technology. Course-embedded assessments showed improvement in scores for student outcomes that were the focus of attention the prior year: SO6 (understanding of computer organization, architecture and operating systems), SO9 (understanding of the need for continuing professional development), and SO12 (proficiency in one of the professional concentrations).

Mechanical Engineering. Faculty applied rubrics in evaluating work from students in eight advanced (300 and 400-level) courses and concluded students would profit from more emphasis on differential equations and advanced calculus and they plan is to consult with the department of Mathematics in that regard. They also identified a weakness in students’ ability to seek out and use information available through library sources in their work; faculty plan to work with librarians on a plan to improve students’ information literacy.

Telecommunications Network Management. Outcome data collected through FCARs was accumulated and analyzed and scores for all program-level outcomes met the faculty’s criterion. Learning outcomes specific to individual courses were addressed actions including introduction of significant in-class active learning projects.

Energy Management. Outcome data from all courses was accumulated and analyzed and scores for all program- and course-level outcomes; to at the program level, faculty introduced on-campus lectures by industry experts as well as site visits to plants and businesses off campus; at the course level, several course syllabi were adjusted to introduce hands-on projects, to devote more attention to topics identified through the assessment as needing reinforcement, and to introduce a wider range of reference materials.

Environmental Technology. Faculty assessed the impact of changes in program learning outcome achievement (measured in thesis courses) introduced in the prior year including expanding project guidelines, introduction of more hands-on work. They also reviewed the findings of an alumni survey conducted during the year and planned an employer survey.

Information, Network, and Computer Security. Course-embedded assessments show improvement in Student Outcome 04 (A comprehensive background in computer security issues) which was the focus of attention from the prior year.

School of Health Professions

Nursing. The goal and focus for the year was to achieve national accreditation from the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE), which was granted April 16, 2011 for the full 5-year maximum. Materials prepared for the accreditation described the
individual student outcomes, measurements used to assess those outcomes, and actions taken to improve learning over the past five years.

**Clinical Nutrition.** The program is 100% online. Faculty analyzed the effects of introduction of modifications to teaching and to the oral presentation assignment (using JING) on learning outcomes related to the learning outcome: “Compose written and oral presentations geared to lay and professional audiences.” They also tested the use of a comprehensive exam to measure learning outcomes #1-4 introduced as an outcome of the prior year’s assessment activities and initiated a student survey.

**Mental Health Counseling.** Conducted focus groups with students and implemented program changes to introduce more active learning and applied assignments into class, add more online material and courses, and hire faculty members with particular areas of expertise.

**Occupational Therapy.** Faculty focus is on improving two student learning outcomes #5 (Select, utilize and interpret appropriate screening and evaluations) and # 6 (Create and implement intervention plans). Strategies include: 1) Integrate relevant teaching and learning strategies into more places in the curriculum, 2) Develop case materials with a wide range of assessments, 3) Incorporate the standardized patient in clinical courses, 4) Examine outcomes of competency examination, 5) Reflect on student learning outcomes in curriculum planning meetings, and 6) Monitor NBCOT scores.

**Physician Assistant Studies.** Analyzed data from the newly introduced Graduate Record Examination (GRE), a medical terminology examination, a preparatory board exam (PACKRAT), didactic Grade Point Average (GPA), clinical GPA, and the 2010 board scores. Specific performance in the anatomy/physiology and pharmacology courses were assessed as these courses were deemed to be the most significant challenges for the first year students in the first semester of the program. Improvement actions include: continuing to use Exam Master, medical terminology exam, and PACKRAT.

**Physical Therapy.** Faculty studied the relationship of student persistence to a variety of demographic and performance factors. They developed a detailed proposal of changes to admission and academic standards designed to select students with the greatest likelihood of succeeding and to identify early on those students likely to fail.

**School of Management**

**Business Administration, Accounting.** Faculty revised 34 master syllabi in the BSBA core and 21 in the majors based on findings from the pilot year. Revisions take account of for elements that were not represented properly during the pilot year and deletions of certain assurance of learning validations. The faculty members understand better the SOM assurance of learning process and are better informed and prepared to implement the GVS to track achievement of learning outcomes at the programmatic, major, and course levels.
Hospitality Management. Faculty externally referenced the existing program for the purpose of reconstruction of the program mission and goals, as well as the benchmarking of these items against peer institutions. They drilled into each goal for the purpose of creating learning objectives and modified the curriculum significantly in order to strengthen the mapping of courses into the newly developed learning objectives. As a result, they designed/will design some new courses, remove or modify others, infusing technology and the rigorous and comprehensive assessment process common to all programs in the School of Management.

Master of Business Administration, Human Resources Management and Labor Relations. Faculty members developed, tested, and revised master syllabi for core courses in the revised MBA curriculum.

College of Osteopathic Medicine

The primary assessment goal for the past year was to continue to implement the Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan, developed by the college in AY 2008-09, in preparation for a “focused” site visit by the Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation (COCA) September 20-21, 2011. The COCA team found that NYCOM met all of the accreditation standards under review, effectively extending the college’s accreditation for the maximum 7-year period. Significantly, the COCA inspectors acknowledged the college’s Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan as “the best they had seen,” and noted that learning outcomes at the college had improved markedly over the past few years.

PROFESSIONAL/SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATIONS

The following programs were accredited or re-accredited by specialized agencies during AY 2010-2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accrediting Agency</th>
<th>Date of (Re) Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.)</td>
<td>National Architecture Accrediting Board (NAAB)</td>
<td>June, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (B.S.)</td>
<td>Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education of the American Association of Nursing (CCNE-AAN)</td>
<td>April 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology</td>
<td>Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)</td>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>Commission for Academic Accreditation, Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>September 27, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SELF-STUDIES ARE POSTED ON THE ASSESSMENT WEB SITE AT HTTP://WWW.NYIT.EDU/PLANNING/ACCREDITATION_SELF_STUDIES/

ASSESSMENT OF CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR UNDERGRADUATES

Written Communication (University-wide, Freshmen and Seniors)

During AY 2010-11, NYIT faculty implemented the Assessment Committee’s plan for assessing general education learning outcomes by choosing one outcome (writing) to be assessed across the university. As fall 2010 saw the introduction of a completely redesigned undergraduate core curriculum, the effort was planned to (1) test a methodology for collecting and analyzing student work across the entire institution – at both the freshman level and senior levels, conducting a faculty-wide discussion of results, and coming to actionable conclusions that get implemented and (2) establish a baseline assessment of students’ abilities as they enter and leave NYIT.

Method. During summer 2010, all degree programs at NYIT submitted writing samples from junior or senior level classes. At the same time, the English department collected persuasive essays from freshman writing 101 classes. In January 2010, 10 English faculty members from both New York campuses scored the 570 samples using a rubric they had developed to judge the writing’s purpose and audience, organization and format, and language and clarity. They presented their findings to the faculty at large on Assessment Day, January 19, 2011.

Outcomes. The Assessment Committee and the English faculty made two recommendations, one about improving writing and one about improving the core assessment process:

1. To improve student writing through the four year curriculum, individual programs should develop “action items” for their major.

2. To improve the writing assessment process, members suggested:
   • Publishing a refined rubric communicating clear expectations about good writing for all faculty members and students.
   • Displaying examples of students’ work for each level of each criterion, including explanatory comments.
   • Providing clearer instruction on the assignment.
   • Creating a storage place for students’ writing work, which will enable random sampling for the follow up assessment.
Critical Thinking (freshmen)

In addition, work on a common research project by 32 teams of freshman students enrolled in several different sections of the required freshman “Foundations of Inquiry” course was evaluated at a retreat for faculty using the AAC&U critical thinking rubric with respect to two criteria: “evidence” and “student’s position.” As expected for freshman, scores were almost uniformly low. Based on information from this formative assessment, faculty redesigned the project to enable students to better learn aspects of critical thinking skills including research methods and evidence by breaking the parts into smaller steps, making the project an individual rather than a group one, and requiring a final verbal presentation. The new assignment was introduced in all sections of the course in fall 2011. Faculty members have also registered for the Performance Task Academy, workshops by the Council for Aid to Education to learn how to develop CLA-style performance tasks in which core curriculum content or concepts can be embedded.

The Committee’s Assessment of the Process and Plans for Going Forward

While the committee appreciated the efforts of the faculty in conducting these assessments, it came to the conclusion that (1) more attention and effort was spent on generating data than drawing conclusions and planning improvements, (2) interpreting the data suffered from lack of benchmark comparisons, and (3) considering one or two outcomes a year is not sufficient. As a result, the committee considered a number of proposals for change to the plan for core learning outcome assessment in the coming academic year. They decided to administer the Collegiate Learning Assessment examination – a standardized examination that is nationally benchmarked and would therefore allow faculty to evaluate how much progress NYIT students are making relative to the progress of students at other colleges. To gauge summative performance authentically, the CLA presents realistic problems that require students to analyze complex materials and determine the relevance to the task and credibility. Students' written responses to the tasks are evaluated to assess their abilities to think critically, reason analytically, solve problems and communicate clearly and cogently – all of which are core learning outcomes at NYIT. Scores are aggregated to the institutional level to provide a signal to the institution about how their students as a whole are performing.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AT NYIT’S GLOBAL SITES

As anticipated, the activities of committees on global campuses focused on local priorities, with the table below giving highlights for each.

Abu Dhabi, UAE
- Participated in the collection and analysis of data for assessment of the core writing outcome
- Held an Assessment day on March 18, 2011
  o Faculty presented results of student learning outcomes assessment in the bachelor of science in Business Administration.
Interior Design faculty presented findings from external program assessment and results by the School of Architecture & Design faculty.

Procedures for student evaluation of teaching were reviewed and discussed.

**Amman, Jordan**
- Participated in the collection and analysis of data for assessment of the core writing outcome.
- Gathered data on the BSBA learning goal: “Use technology as a decision-support tool in business and in the major” as a “best practice” case study from courses in the matrix identified as supporting the goal.
- The committee found that few courses contained assignments intentionally crafted to demonstrate students’ competence (or foster progress) on the designated outcome.
- At Assessment Day, the results of the above assessment were presented to the faculty at large, which, at the end, endorsed the idea of generating consistent sets of student work by developing intentional key assignments for measuring program outcomes within courses in the matrix (and to be sure names of students and faculty be removed before analysis).

**Manama, Bahrain**
- Participated in the collection and analysis of data for assessment of the core writing outcome.
- Finalized grade moderation policy

(Note: With the unrest in Bahrain, the work of the Assessment Committee was suspended for most of the spring semester)

**Vancouver, Canada**
- Regular meetings during the AY 2010-2011 were held by the Assessment Committee of the MBA program in Vancouver with a focus on understanding the learning outcomes in the new curriculum (to be implemented fall 2011) as well as the relevant learning validations and the concepts of scores and grades.

**CREATING A CULTURE OF ASSESSMENT**

**Assessment Days**

More than 200 faculty members, along with the provost and academic deans, participated in each of two university-wide Assessment Days.

**January 19, 2011.** All NYIT faculty teaching undergraduates were invited to gather at the NYIT Auditorium on Broadway. The program focused on the core student writing outcome. Faculty heard from their colleagues in the English department about the results of the baseline assessment of undergraduate writing conducted in the fall 2010 semester across all majors and all
NYIT locations. Discussion centered on tools available to help students improve their writing skills. In afternoon sessions faculty met with others from their programs to work on aspects of their annual assessment plans - as determined by their chairs and deans.

In assessment committee discussion afterward, committee members suggested each individual program should have a conversation about how to improve student writing within their programs and submit the “action items” in the 2010-2011 annual assessment reports. Especially, faculty who are not English professor should share with their peers about what has worked in their courses.

NOTE: Faculty from graduate programs in the Schools of Education and Health Professions met in Old Westbury (and not in Manhattan) on their own assessment plans.

August 31, 2011. As proposed by the Assessment Committee, the second assessment day was reserved for faculty for faculty from all programs to work on aspects of their annual assessment activities and plans.

Conferences. Numerous faculty and staff members attended conferences on assessing student learning or participated in assessments for accreditation of other programs between September 2010 and September 2011:

**ABET Program Evaluator Training Workshop**, Washington, DC: July 2010 - Nada Anid

**Strategic Management at the Crossroads**, the 30th Strategic Management Society Annual International Conference; Rome, Italy, September 2010 – Frank Mruk

**Faculty Workshop on Sustainable Assessment Processes**, Baltimore, Maryland, October 2010 – Steven Lu, Yoshi Saito

**ABET Program Observer visits**: October 2010, DeVry University Phoenix, AZ – Babak Beheshti

**Workshops on Criteria and process related to Assessment and Evaluation**, American Association of Colleges of Nursing semi-annual meetings, Washington, DC, November 2010, March 2011 – Sue Neville

**ABET Assessment Webinar**, Assessment Day, January 19, 2011 (all Engineering faculty)

**Creating High Performance Organizations for the New World**, Association for Strategic Planning Annual Conference Dallas, TX, February 2011 – Frank Mruk

**ABET Workshop** sponsored by Electrical and Computer Engineering Department Heads Association, Phoenix, Arizona, March 2011 – Ayat Jafari
AACN/CCNE Webinars on Assessment, multiple, throughout spring 2011 (Nursing faculty)

Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA) Workshop, Denver, CO, March 2011 – Martha Siegel

MSCHE Standard 14: Linking Course & Program Level Learning Assessments, Garden City, NY, April 2011 – Patricia Burlaud, Diane Igoche, Shifang Li, Francy Magee, Michael Uttendorfer

Workshop Aggregate Assessment related to Accreditation Criteria, Council of Deans & Directors of Nursing, Senior Colleges and Universities in New York State, Albany, NY, April 2011 – Sue Neville

New Physical Therapy Faculty Workshop, Ithaca NY, July 2011: Teresa Ingenito

Workshop on Education for the Physician Assistant, St. Louis, MO, July 2011 – Barbara Piccirillo and Sal Barese