



Student Learning Assessment Report (SLAR)

Instructions: This template is a running document of each annual Academic Program Assessment Report due to the department chairs and Provost the last Friday in October. The final report in the document should be the official report of the year of the full Program Review. All reports below use the same report template. If the report is the Program Review year, please indicate it next to "Program Review Year" and also submit the Academic Program Review (APR).

Department: AGTS

Academic Program Evaluated: MAIS **Program Review Year:** Submitted 2018-2019 Next 2020-2021

	Year 1 Academic Year: 2017-18	Year 2 Academic Year: 2018- 2019	Year 3 Academic Year:	Year 4 Academic Year:
Faculty members involved in this assessment process: (List all faculty members who participated: program coordinator, reviewers, committee members, etc.)	DeLonn Rance Valerie Rance Paul Lewis Anita Koeshall Mark Hausfeld Jerry Ireland	DeLonn Rance Valerie Rance Paul Lewis Bob Braswell Mark Hausfeld Wendy Brown		
Number of students in sample: (If known, supply the number of students in each class/year who were used in the assessment report.)	Graduate: 11 MAIS Students	Graduate: 16 MAIS Students	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:	Freshmen: Sophomores: Juniors: Seniors: Graduate:

Instrument(s) used in assessment: (List the exams, standardized tests, portfolios, etc. that were used in the assessment process.)	Capstone projects from required courses evaluated each student's progress on a scale of 0 to 4 toward the student learning outcomes utilizing a standard rubric for each outcome.	Capstone projects from required courses evaluated each student's progress on a scale of 0 to 4 toward the student learning outcomes utilizing a standard rubric for each outcome.		
<i>Additional Data:</i> (List any additional information/data that informed this report.)				
Methodology: (Explain the method of data collection and the data analysis process.)	The data from the capstone projects was tabulated electronically and summarized in chart form for faculty review.	The data from the capstone projects was tabulated electronically and summarized in chart form for faculty review.		
Results of Assessment: (List the findings in summary format as narrative.)	The high averages ranging from 3.67 to 4.0 clearly indicate that the SLOs are being met.	The averages ranging from 3.08 to 4.0 clearly indicate that the SLOs are being met.		
Data: (Provide the graphs, charts, etc. that were used to show data results. Do not include the actual data.)	Attached	Attached		
Strengths: (From the findings, list the areas of strengths that currently exist in the academic program.)	The SLOs cover broad areas of formation in multiple disciplines. High averages across disciplines and courses indicated a robust learning environment.	The SLOs cover broad areas of formation in multiple disciplines. High averages across disciplines and courses indicated a robust learning environment.		

Areas in need of improvement: (From the findings, list the areas of weakness(s) that currently exist in the academic program.)	No weaknesses identified. However, faculty continue to actualize their content and methodologies to meet the challenges of a diverse learning community.	This year the overall averages of SLOs decreased. In the faculty review two causes were identified: 1. The primary cause in the lower averages for Online and Directed Research courses (with some exceptions). Faculty noted that the online courses with low averages were not GMD courses. 2. Some averages were impacted by students who received failing grades because they did not complete the course. Others scored low on the final assessment, but their overall grade for the course indicates that the outcomes are being met.		
---	--	---	--	--

Year 1:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Faculty commits to continuing to update both content and methodology to meet PLOs.	Each semester	Each faculty member.

Year 1:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date
Course revisions	Start of each course.

Year 2:

Plans for improvement: (Provide the improvement plan, when it will be implemented, and person who will administer the improvement plan.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Plan for Improvement	Timeline	Responsible Person
Improve online courses	January 2020	Each online professor
Seek to decrease the number of enrolled Directed Research courses by updating program course sequencing and publishing to course commons.	By January 2020	DeLonn and Valerie Rance

Year 2:

Improvements made: (List completed improvement plans and dates of actual implementation.)

*If an A.A. degree is part of this program, describe how the changes to this program affect the A.A. degree, if any.

Improvement Plan	Implementation Date
Pending	Pending