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This is the fourth 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 on the Academic Senate web site at http://my.nyit.edu/group/academic-senate/assessment

2011-2012 Outcomes

- 90% of academic programs submitted Assessment Plans for AY 2011-2012 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, as agreed, reviewed, discussed and provided feedback to faculty and deans.

- The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) – a standardized, benchmarked examination that directly assesses student learning over time for two core learning outcomes – was administered, evaluated, and formed the basis for action planning at the August 29, 2012 Assessment Day.

- Meaningful assessment work continued on NYIT’s global campuses.
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.nyit.edu/planning/outcomes_assessment/academic_assessment/)

A summary of AY 2011-12 actions, by program, follows:

School of Architecture and Design

Architecture. Based on reviews of student work and on recommendations of the re-accreditation visiting team, faculty made a variety of changes to curriculum, including:

- Introduced a foundational set of freehand drawing exercises to Visualization I to improve students’ drawing skills; based on results, a more refined and structured set of assignments will be developed for next semester;
- Simplified assignments in Vis 2 to allocate more time spent to 2D AutoCAD drafting skills and included sample in-class assignments in the course books to represent benchmark skills expected each week;
- Simplified Vis 3 to allocate more time to 3D modeling and rendering skills in 3D Studio Max and focused the new syllabus on iterative modeling and rendering exercises of a museum case study;
- Adopted strategies to improve students’ skills and ability in design development, design thinking, schematic design, ordering systems, team work, and use of precedents;
- Developed an online library of scaled drawings for all case study assignments for use by all faculty, along with a strategic set of suggested supplementary readings, teaching aids, and handouts in support of each course, as well as samples of exemplary student work.
**Interior Design.** During AY 2011-2012, the department explored ways to improve the written and verbal skills of students in their thesis-year booklets and presentations. Mid-semester, DSGN 401 students presented three thesis ideas and three potential buildings to place their ideas into using video/movie. Then, based on collaborative feedback from their peers – with the more experienced helping those with less – they revised their work, focusing the final presentations on only the selected thesis idea and building. Both faculty and outside critics at the December presentations found the clarity of both the verbal and visual presentations improved over past sessions: they were organized and concise, with many students having researched their topics thoroughly and written out notes for the presentations. The exercise was expanded upon as an element of their final thesis presentation in spring 2012, with less success, partially due to the amount of work demanded for the model and board presentations. However, the resulting final thesis booklets were improved overall and the process refined in the coming academic year.

**College of Arts and Sciences**

**Advertising.** Faculty from the B.S. in Advertising submitted an assessment report which the committee found inadequate. Focus was on student performance in once course and failed to identify program level outcomes, assessment methods, evaluation criteria, findings, or improvement plans. Members of the committee and the office of Planning & Assessment will work closely with the program chair and faculty during AY 2012-13 to ensure that assessment expectations are met.

**Behavioral Sciences/ Psychology/ Criminal Justice.** Faculty from these programs worked on two program learning outcomes: (1) They collected direct and indirect measures of criminal justice student learning related to the program outcome “…students will effectively communicate course material orally” following changes made in response to assessments in 2010-11 and found improved performance; (2) They collected direct and indirect measures of students’ understanding of descriptive and inferential statistics and identified areas of deficit; changes in the Statistics and Research Methods courses are planned, as is re-assessment during 2012-13. They also surveyed graduating students.

**Communication Arts.** Faculty assessed student learning with respect to program outcomes “Research, evaluate, organize and convey information to a variety of audiences in written, oral and visual forms” in projects in freshman and senior-level courses; recommendations were made to increase the number of writing projects. They also considered data relating to “Integrate the principles of social responsibility and media ethics into their work.”

**Fine Arts.** Faculty from the BFA in Fine Arts submitted an assessment report describing their work on curriculum revision during AY 2011-12. The committee informed the chair that while curriculum change in response to assessment is admirable, faculty have a responsibility to continue to assess student learning outcomes as they undergo the lengthy process of revising a curriculum. The chair acknowledged the feedback and the faculty presented a well though-out plan for AY 2012-13 focused on assessing learning in the area of critical thinking.
Interdisciplinary Studies. Given that this is a degree completed primarily by students who failed to complete their original major, it is not surprising that assessment of student work in capstone courses continues to show mediocre program learning outcomes. Faculty have instituted a comprehensive internship requirement in the major (IDSP 450), supervised by staff from Career Services and Central Advising. They have also developed a proposal for a program to attract older and non-traditional students to try and attract students with more focus.

Life Sciences. The focus was on developing a standardized assessment methodology across campuses and sections of chemistry courses to enable useful curriculum development and planning. Realignment between laboratory assignments and lectures will occur in fall 2012.

Political Science. Learning outcome #3 (“…research and write a report which displays critical thinking, logical arguments, and a sophisticated array of sources”) was evaluated by review of work from newly introduced political science seminar courses (300-level). In addition, faculty have developed an alumni survey instrument to collect data on program outcomes relating to employment, civic participation, and lifelong learning.

School of Education

Teacher Education: A 2011 review of the capstone assessment noted that there was no literacy component. One was added as a formative assessment in AY 2011-12. Faculty mapped literacy instruction to the curriculum and embedded appropriate assignments and assessments. They also developed measures and assignments/assessments for “parent and community support and involvement.”

Instructional Technology. The MSIT program faculty maintains an e-Portfolio system and annually examines student performance in keystone assignments for each of the 12 program courses. Based on scores in these assessments, the faculty concluded that the majority of students are performing at acceptable (target) levels. However, reviewers from the Association for Educational Communication and Technology (ACET) found that the degree of detail in the standards (as measured by the program) was insufficient and the chair and dean worked over the summer to realign the student learning outcomes to the latest AECT Standards and Elements (2009). The new rubrics will be reviewed by faculty through the fall semester and implemented in spring 2013.

School Counseling. The faculty completed their self-study for accreditation with the Council for Counseling and Related Accreditation Program (CACREP) that required them to conduct a comprehensive alignment of the CACREP standards with program competencies and learner outcomes. The analysis showed that 95% or more of the standards are delivered through the foundation and core curriculum.

Leadership and Technology. Faculty prepared a self-study for accreditation with the Educational Leadership Constituents Council (ELCC) demonstrating how the program meets the organization’s standards for advanced programs in educational leadership.
School of Engineering and Computing Sciences

Computer Science, Electrical Computer Engineer, and Information Technology: Consistent with the recommendations of the program’s accrediting agency (ABET), faculty established a 6-year assessment plan for Student Outcomes assessment, with each of the program’s 11 outcomes being assessed every three years. In AY 2011-12, faculty considered evidence concerning: “ability to design, implement, and evaluate a computer-based system, process, component, or program…,” “ability to function on multidisciplinary teams,” and “ability to communicate effectively.” Improvement actions include: involving Industry Advisory Board members in reviewing capstone design project proposals, making changes to documentation requirements for group projects, and adding requirements to written and oral presentations that focus students’ attention on organization, level of detail, and mechanics.

Computer Science (M.S.), in AY 2011-2012, faculty choose SO3: “Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of mathematical and algorithmic concepts and analysis” to assess and data were collected through CSCI 610, 651, and 670 and scores computed through FCARs. The final score did not meet the benchmark values. Faculty concluded this was a result of the very large class size offered via DL in one of the courses and suggested that if these courses had sufficient enrollment at each campus, the DL mode of instruction should not be used in the future.

Electrical Computer Engineering (M.S.). Faculty chose SO2: “Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of advanced topics in mathematics and stochastic processes” to assess for the AY 2011-2012. Data were collected through EENG 635, and EENG751 and the score was computed through FCARs. The program level score for this outcome was 2.25, and 83% of the students achieved scores of E (excellent) & G (good). Both of these scores met the benchmark.

Information, Network and Computer Security (M.S.). In AY 2011-2012 faculty assessed SO 7: “Demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of topics in mathematics and stochastic process.” Data were collected through CSCI 641, 690, AND 755 and scores were computed through FCARs. The program level score was 2.13 and 82% of the students achieved scores of E (excellent) and G (good). Both of these scores met the benchmark value set by faculty.

Mechanical Engineering. Based on input from its Industrial Advisory Board the department significantly added to the array of software available to and used by the students. The computer lab now supports the senior design classes as well as engineering graphics (AutoCad), Introduction to CAD/CAM (Catia and Pro/E), Machine Design (HyperWorks, OptiStruct and Radioss), and basics of visual data acquisition with LabVIEW. A comprehensive Comsol product array was acquired for forthcoming Fluid Mechanics and Heat Transfer classes, beginning in fall 2012. In addition, faculty continue to work with faculty in the departments of mathematics and English to improve student’s skills in those areas.

Electrical and Computer Engineering Technology /Telecommunications Network Management.

The department assessed program learning outcomes through FCARs (faculty course assessment report) and found that scores measuring each program outcome (a-k) were well above the benchmark. Nevertheless, faculty proposed the following actions to improve students’ learning:
• It was suggested in CTEC 204 Programming Techniques require students to resubmit their projects after first correction.
• Replace adjunct faculty with FT faculty to teach CTEC 216 Digital System.
• It was suggested to request a project room, a $2000 to pay for the parts and hardware required by the projects and to keep the final designs for showcase for ETEC 495
• Prof. Kashani redesigned the course and added a lab component to CTEC 311 Operating Systems.
• Prof. Beheshti suggested requiring from the students a research project in TELE 210 Data Communications:

**Energy Management (M.S.)** The department assessed program learning outcomes through FCARs (faculty course assessment report) and found that scores measuring each program outcome were well above the benchmark. Nevertheless, the faculty has taken the following actions to improve the program: In light of the March 2011 earthquake and nuclear disaster in Japan, additional class time was devoted to the environmental impacts associated with nuclear energy, including both normal operations and various accident scenarios. More class time was devoted to examples of environmental analysis conducted as part of an M.S. thesis. This enabled students to recognize how environmental impacts and issues can be presented and related to their thesis research. Additional real-world details were added to the practical design problem. In addition, the instructions were edited to clarify which solutions should be considered.

**Environmental Technology.** Faculty from the M.S. Environmental Technology program submitted an assessment report describing some curriculum changes in credit hours, grant submission, and other initiatives but containing very limited information on student learning outcomes assessment. Members of Office of Planning and Assessment have informed the chairperson their report doesn’t meet the committee’s requirements and will work closely with the department to have a concrete, feasible and plan and timeline for AY 2012-13.

**School of Health Professions**

**Nursing.** Faculty focused on 2 learning outcomes “Demonstrate a theoretical knowledge base that incorporates critical thinking and evidenced-based research findings to guide nursing practice and clinical decision making” and “Use interpersonal and technological communication effectively in the delivery, documentation and evaluation of safe care.” Faculty assessment has led to the following recommendations of intervention for improvement:
1. Use NCLEX-RN format stressing level 3 and 4 (analysis, application & evaluation) for all exams;
2. Train faculty on Test Question Construction focused on higher critical thinking levels.
3. Review and revise course syllabi to include critical thinking exercises;
4. Revise senior-level capstone course evaluation to include data related to the evaluation of students’ performance by their preceptors;
5. Require students to review and analyze selected evidence-based best practices and evaluate the application to selected practice scenarios;
6. Designate NURS 480 Nursing Capstone Course as a writing-intensive course involving essay-writing to give students an exit opportunity to demonstrate communication and critical
thinking skills: developing a hypothesis and supporting it with evidence-based practice examples.

7. Increase integration of Simulation Technology to enhance communication.

**Clinical Nutrition.** The department chose program learning outcome “compose written and oral presentations geared to lay and professional audiences in online courses” as one of the focus of AY 11-12’ program assessment. Online presentation through Jing was used as the instrument to assess students’ achievement, and the outcome well meets the benchmark. Program outcome 1,2,3,4 were also measured through a comprehensive examination, and the score of at least 19 (benchmark) was achieved by 100% students. An exit survey was used again to find out how effective of the remediation actions faculty took has changed students’ negative comments related to delayed responses from instructors. The actions include a) email response within 48 hours, b) Assignment return within 2 weeks, c). Inclusion of syllabus of how best to communicate with instructor: email course messaging or discussion board forum. Survey results indicate that students are very pleased with faculty’s prompt responses and track of those who left the program found that no one left the program because of dissatisfaction with the program.

**Mental Health Counseling.** Program to be discontinued based on conclusions of program review.

**Occupational Therapy.** To assess progress on learning outcomes #5 and #6, the entire OT faculty assessed student work using rubrics supplied by the instructors from two physical disabilities courses (OCTH 710 Pediatrics and OCTH 705 OT Theory III). They found varied performance in clinical reasoning (selecting assessments and creating evaluation plans) with some students performing well and others showing a range of difficulties in clinical reasoning skewing the effectiveness of the intervention plan. Faculty plan to take following actions to improve students’ performance: incorporate case studies with a clinical reasoning component in all practice courses, implement experiences with standardized patients into OT theory III. Repeat examination of student learning outcomes on #5 and #6 will take place in fall of 2012: Work from the same two courses will be used, but a greater range of student work will be selected for re-assessment, focusing on evaluation and intervention that demonstrate clinical reasoning.

**Physician Assistant Studies.** The focus of the 2011-2012 program assessment was to use Standardized Patient (SP) encounters to assess students’ interpersonal skills, communication skills and professionalism over the course of their clinical year (in the field). Results showed that the one area that did not improve significantly was “Informing, educating and counseling the patient.” The SP encounters are 25 minutes each and it is unclear if this finding is a testing artifact (i.e., this kind of communication occurs at the end of the encounter and students may have run out of time) or whether they really did not improve. In 2012-13, the resident faculty will stress the topic’s importance in didactic courses and changes will be made to Clinical Skills, Behavioral Medicine, and Health Promotion and Disease Prevention courses to allow students more practice. Additional standardized patient encounters will be added to the didactic portion of the curriculum for more practice, and clinical preceptors were informed that this is an area that should be stressed while on clinical rotations.
Physical Therapy. Faculty analyzed the results of an iPad initiative for first year students and made curricular changes based on those results. iPads will now be mandatory for all incoming students allowing increased adoption of e-books, lab videos, medical/PT apps to replace textbooks where possible, and videotaping retake practical examinations for student self-reflection.

School of Management

B.S.BA. Program

During 2011-2012 academic year, B.S.BA faculty and administrators made adaptations to the master syllabus introduced in fall 2010, revised some course learning goals and modified some assurance of learning validations. They determined attainment “scores” for *general learning goals* (using data from 34 class sections, and 2127 measurements) yielding an average score of 3.50 and *management-specific learning goals* (35 class sections, and 2761 measurements) yielding an average score of 3.48 (5 = Exceptional; 3 = Meets Expectation; and 1 = Failing).

Data analysis identified that there was a significant (p<.01) drop in the management-specific learning goal score over prior years. As these goals are important outcomes for students’ success after graduation the faculty decided to focus on Management-specific learning goal M4O1 in next year’s assessment (Integrate functional disciplines together to affect sound policy making and business planning; contribute an analysis in support of, or develop, a business plan). Plans include (1) adding a formative assessment (draft document) which faculty will comment on before the final project is submitted (in ACCT 101, ACCT 110, BUSI 405, LLAW 110, LLAW 210, and MIST 315); (2) modifying the description of the assignment so that it is clearer (BUSI 405, BUSI 435, FINC 401, MGMT 200, MRKT 200, QANT 201, and QANT 300); (3) adding an assessment, such as a quiz, that will focus student attention on integrating course topics in support of business planning (FINC 201); and (4) adding a lecture on business planning to MRKT 200 and QANT 405. Rubrics for all program learning goals and objectives will be developed starting fall 2012.

MBA program

Faculty reviewed the revised curriculum for the MBA program. Forty-seven of 58 master syllabi were revised, including those for all 14 of the non-waiveable MBA core. Actions: several assessments were modified; 24 scores linked to general or major-specific learning goals were eliminated and another 15 were added; 8 invariant learning goals were eliminated, 5 were added and 1 was modified. The master syllabus QANT 610 – Operations Management master syllabus underwent a major revision and rubrics defining the criteria against which each dimension of each learning objective will be scored were developed for the MBA programmatic learning goals and the Decision Sciences, Finance, and Marketing concentrations (will be applied starting fall 2012).
College of Osteopathic Medicine

Preclinical Education

Based upon recommendations from NYCOM’s Course and Faculty Assessment Program, the department of preclinical education has implemented several academic modifications: the use of new software (Lecture Tools- an audience response system) to increase the opportunity for formative student assessment within class sessions; implementation of electronic examinations (ExamSoft) to provide a more eco-friendly and data-rich testing option; and the development of in-house online resources to provide ready student access to learning materials. More than 80% of student recommendations have been adapted in the past academic year.

Clinical Education

Focusing on the department of clinical education’s objective to maintain or improve the COMLEX II CE Licensing Examination pass rate, new guidelines have been established to support and assist students in their preparation. Any 3rd year student who has difficulty passing one of the COMAT (Comprehensive Osteopathic Achievement Exams - Family Medicine, Internal Medicine, Obstetrics and Gynecology, Pediatrics, Psychiatry, and Surgery) which is given in advance of the COMLEX II CE, is now required to participate in a tutorial in that subject. Tutorials are conducted or coordinated by the relevant clinical chairperson and include a personalized study plan and face-to-face meetings for academic support. Any student who continues to have difficulty with the COMAT Examination is assigned a mentor and participates in an additional four week clerkship focusing on the area of difficulty.
The following programs were accredited or re-accredited by specialized agencies during AY 2011-2012:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Accrediating Agency</th>
<th>Date of (Re) Accreditation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master of Business Administration</td>
<td>Commission for Academic Accreditation, Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Education, People’s Republic of China (for program at Jiangxi University of Finance and Economics)</td>
<td>December 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Quality Assessment Board, British Columbia</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine</td>
<td>Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation (COCA)</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE) of the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA),</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. in Physician Assistant Studies</td>
<td>Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management</td>
<td>The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSBB) advanced the programs in the NYIT School of Management to pre-candidate status</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Studies are posted on the Assessment web site at [http://www.nyit.edu/planning/accreditation_self_studies/](http://www.nyit.edu/planning/accreditation_self_studies/)
ASSESSMENT OF CORE LEARNING OUTCOMES (UNDERGRADUATES)

In 2010-2011, the Assessment Committee assessed NYIT’s progress in assessing core learning outcomes and concluded that the process developed for the new core curriculum needed revision. The goal of the change was to: (1) focus more on making improvements than gathering data; (2) develop results that are benchmarked with student performance at other institutions; and (3) enable faculty to work on more than one outcome at a time.

Thus, for 2011-2012, the committee chose to administer the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) – a standardized, benchmarked examination that directly assesses student learning. Measures include Performance Tasks and Analytic Tasks which present realistic problems that require students to analyze complex materials. Students’ written responses to the tasks are graded to assess:

- Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation
- Writing Effectiveness
- Writing Mechanics
- Problem Solving

The CLA tests the abilities of incoming students and the abilities of graduating seniors; it measures the “value added” by institutions by controlling for entering academic ability (measured by SAT, GPA etc.). When the average performance of seniors at a school is better than expected based on statistical models, this school is said to have high “value added.”

The CLA was administered to 104 entering freshmen from all academic schools in fall 2011 and to 102 graduating seniors (6 were transfer students) in spring 2012. Results showed that:

- **NYIT Freshmen** score at the mean of all schools for all 4 skills, although only 64% have English as first language (v. 87% for all schools);
- **NYIT Seniors** score at the mean for all schools for all 4 skills, although only 54% have English as first language (v. 87% for all schools).

The table below is a graphic display of the “Value Added” by NYIT (red dot) which shows that students’ degree of improvement from freshman to senior year for all four skills is “as expected” and is right in the middle of all CLA schools.
These results were presented to the faculty as a whole at the August 29, 2012 Assessment Day, where methods for improving student learning in these areas were discussed (see below, page 13).

**Assessment of Learning Outcomes in Freshman Foundation courses**

**Written Communication.** In the context of improving the newly developed “Foundations of College Composition” course, faculty used a rubric to evaluate freshman-level writing on a persuasive essay – common to all sections of the course. Their area of greatest weakness was engaging reasonably and fairly with opposing views and different perspectives; improvement plans include encouraging faculty to more carefully vet topics with students; developing a “toolbox” of ways to teach students how to understand, assess, engage, and refute the opposition; and offering a faculty workshop on strategies and tools for teaching the subject.

**Critical Thinking and Scientific Literacy.** Online surveys of freshman in FCIQ 101 and FCSC 101, systematic review of student work, and results from administration of a scientific literacy assessment instrument allowed faculty, at dedicated summer institutes,
to make changes to improve outcomes, including (1) revisions to initial lecture material in FCSC 101 to create a stronger foundation, (2) revision of final projects in FCIQ to develop student research skills and critical thinking, (2) revision of assigned reading, topics, and modes of content delivery; (3) revision of information literacy (research training) delivery system to a blended model; (4) additional instructor training and more aggressive adjunct instructor recruitment; (5) development of indirect methods of assessment to assess learning on a semester basis and (6) additional hands-on experiments, discussion and experiential learning opportunities.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AT NYIT’S GLOBAL SITES

Abu Dhabi, UAE

- Due to significant personnel changes for this campus, the Assessment Committee was simplified to the campus dean, the assistant deans, and the Director for Institutional Research and Assessment.
- Moreover, for the entire fall semester, there was no local leadership for the School of Management, which represents 86% of student enrollment at this site. As a result, there was no discussion of assessment at the beginning of the year.
- The Assessment Committee held its opening meeting in November 2011, but in fall and start of spring, the work focused more on harmonizing degree maps and other high priority tasks (schedules and advising tasks).
- By the end of March, faculty in the School of Management requested the Assessment Committee to postpone Assessment Day till fall 2012. An October date is now envisioned.
- The Arts & Sciences faculty participated actively in the fall 2011 collection and analysis of data for the institutional assessment of the core Foundation of Scientific Process course.

Vancouver, Canada

Regular meetings during AY 2011-2012 were held by the Assessment Committee of the MBA program in Vancouver with a focus on developing contextualized learning goals (and validations) for all 13 required core courses and several electives. For example, they added the following to a required finance course: “...will be able to Summarize current events regarding ethical financial decision making and reporting in Canada including the differences of perspectives between non-Canadian and Canadian companies.” Stakeholder input in the process was gathered via surveys of alumni and employers. Faculty continued to maintain course portfolios with samples of student work related to specific learning outcomes and began to collect “scores” as part of the School of Management’s comprehensive, online Goal Validation System. With the introduction of the revised MBA in fall 2011, administration of the ETS Major Field Test in business at the master’s level was made mandatory for all entering and graduating students. This provides a systematic method
of comparing students’ subject-matter competencies at the beginning and end of their educational experience. Results were analyzed, and recommendations made to the School of Management leadership.

Nanjing, the People’s Republic of China

The Assessment Committee in Nanjing launched a programmatic assessment exercise during fall 2011 focusing on the BS in Computer Science outcome that students demonstrate “…an ability to use a variety of computer programming languages and be competent at least in one high level language.” Arts & Sciences faculty also participated actively in the fall 2011 collection and analysis of data for the institutional assessment of the core Foundation of Scientific Process course.

Data from the Computer Science assessment were shared with all faculties at Assessment Day, April 27, 2012 and improvement planning continues through fall 2012. Also part of the Assessment Day program were discussions of plagiarism and academic honesty.

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 18, 2012. The morning session was devoted to a Leadership Session for committee members and academic deans, associate deans, chairs and assessment coordinators, the goals of which were (1) to build relationships across school lines and (2) develop administrative and assessment skills in the group by sharing examples of best practice. Brief presentations were organized around six themes:

- Faculty involvement (Nick Bloom; Frank Mruk/Matt Altwicker)
- Curriculum revision (Tom Scandalis/Ron Portanova/Bonnie Grant; Jess Boronico)
- Improved instrument (Mindy Haar)
- Indirect Assessment (Yoshi Saito, Frank Lee)
- Pedagogy revision (Karen Friel; Sue Neville),
- A “compass” to guide students (Sarah McPherson)

Despite the fact that time ran out before the agenda was complete (two presentations were not able to be made and the intended discussion of obstacles was also cut), participants found the session informative. There was ample discussion during the session and feedback from a follow-up questionnaire will help in future planning.

Afternoon sessions were held, as usual, in schools/programs as planned by the academic deans.
August 29, 2012. The morning session was devoted to improving students’ critical thinking, defined in 2009 in NYIT’s revised core curriculum as: “Students make decisions and solve problems based on research, logic, and qualitative and quantitative analyses of appropriate and relevant data and information.” Results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (conducted in AY 2011-2012 with entering freshmen and graduating seniors at NYIT-New York) were presented and a panel of faculty members – from all of NYIT’s schools, who teach at all levels and on both New York campuses – led a discussion of ways to conceptualize and evaluate critical thinking both in a generic sense and in the disciplines, as well how to encourage more of it in our students. A “Gallery” of examples used by panel members was set up on the web site of the Center for Teaching and Learning (http://www.nyit.edu/ctl/critical_thinking/) and others were encouraged to contribute.

As usual, faculty members attended program/school meetings organized by their academic deans and chairs to work on aspects of your annual assessment plans, either on that afternoon or another agreed-upon time.

The Assessment Committee solicits feedback through following these annual events. Results from 18 participants in the January 18 session and 64 faculty participants from August 29 indicated that faculty in general found both formats to be stimulating and many offered suggestions to improve future sessions.

Assessment Web Site

Improvements were made to the Assessment web site to make it a better resource for faculty: content was updated, navigation was streamlined, and assessment guidelines recently made available by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the National Institute of Learning Outcome Assessment (NILOA), and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation’s (CHEA) were added, along with examples of good practice at NYIT (http://www.nyit.edu/planning/best_practices/)

Conferences, Training, and visiting other institutions as part of Accreditation Teams.

Numerous faculty and staff members attended conferences or training on assessing student learning or participated in assessments for accreditation of other programs between September 2011 and September 2012:

- AACOM Meeting: Workshop – What does Quality Mean to Osteopathic Medicine, Baltimore, MD: April 2012 - Bonnie Granat, Ph.D.
- ABET Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) Institutional Representatives Orientation, Washington, DC: July 2012 - Nada Anid, Steve Billis
- ABET Symposium, St. Louis, MO: April 2012 - Frank Lee
- ABET visit as a Program Evaluator for the TAC Commission of ABET, University of Toledo, Toledo, OH: October 2011 - Babak Beheshti
• **ABET visit as a Program Evaluator for the EAC Commission of ABET**, Hampton University, Norfolk, VA: October 2011 – Nada Anid
• ACOFP Committee on Education & Evaluation, Chicago: September 2011; Washington, D.C., January 2012 - Nancy Bono D.O.
• Assessing Student Learning Outcomes webinar, Old Westbury Campus, May 2011 -- Campus Life team
• ATI (Assessment Technologies Institute) *Curriculum Assessment and Outcomes Alignment Workshop*, Old Westbury, NY. April 2012 - Nursing Faculty
• CAA Assessment Training Workshop, 3rd conference of the Middle East and North Africa branch of the Association for Institutional Research (MENA-AIR), Cairo, October 12-15, 2011 - Garon Wheeler & Raed Elzenaty.
• **CACREP Self-Study Training Workshop**, Nashville, TN: October 2011 - Summer Bendfelt
• CLA Performance Task Academy, New York, January 5-6, 2012 – Shifang Li and Joby Jacob
• COMAT Family Medicine Shelf Exam Committee, Chicago: October 2011- Nancy Bono D.O.
• IAMSE Annual Meeting: Workshop - *Developmental Assessment: Core to Competency Based Models in Medical Education & Developing Learning Objectives*, Portland, OR: June 2012 – Bonnie Granat, Ph.D.
• LIRSLN Higher Education meeting, *AAC&U Assessment Rubrics, Hofstra University, NY*; May 7, 2012 – Adrienne McNally
• NBOME *Standard Setting Session for COMLEX-USA Level 2-PE*, Conshohocken, PA: May 2012 – Sonia Rivera-Martinez, DO, FACOFP
• NCAA *Education and Training Symposium*, Indianapolis, IN: June 2012 – Clyde Doughty
• NCATE Training Webinar "*Institutions Submitting Program Reports in AIMS for Fall 2011*": August 30, 2011 - Michael Uttendorfer
• NCATE Training Webinar "*Updates on the Continuous Improvement Accreditation Option*": November 17, 2011 - Michael Uttendorfer
• NCATE Training Webinar "*Everything You Wanted to Know About CAEP-State Partnerships But Were Afraid To Ask*": June 15, 2012 - Michael Uttendorfer
• **PAEA Annual Education Forum**, New Orleans, LA: November 2-6, 2011- Salvatore Barese, Frank Acevedo
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

At its October 4, 2012 meeting, the members of the committee reviewed and discussed a draft of this report. Based on a review of assessment activities at NYIT during AY 2011-12, they offer the following recommendations for improving assessment processes and products at NYIT to NYIT’s Academic Senate, President, Provost, and Vice-President for Health Sciences and Medical Affairs:

1. Make continued improvement to institutional assessment processes more systematic. Go from one-on-one feedback by Assessment Committee members to individual departments (the practice for the past several years) to systematic development by the Committee of a multi-year plan to improve the quality of program assessment at NYIT. Use the MSCHE rubric as a guide to assessing institutional processes as a whole; adapt the MSCHE rubric so that it can be used to assess learning outcome assessment processes in individual academic programs.

2. Assessment staff should publicize the resources on the assessment web site; link to the Center for Teaching and Learning; make it easier to find on the NYIT site.

3. Assessment staff should be more proactive in informing deans, chairs and faculty of outside workshops on assessment.

4. Faculty involved in assessing undergraduate core learning outcomes should consider enhancing assessment of core learning outcomes through development of a “Knowledge Survey” about the courses they take, asking which core learning outcomes have been advanced (in foundation courses, seminars, in the major)

5. The Provost, VPHSMA and deans should systematically follow-up with both core faculty and degree programs regarding the data from the CLA and the conclusion at Assessment Day that we can do a much better job of improving critical thinking in our students.